NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26 (legislative day of January 16), 1956:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard H. Levet, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice John C. Knox, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Oliver Gasch, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years, vice Leo A. Rover, elevated.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26 (legislative day of January 16) 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Frederick Henry Mueller, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Harold Chadick McClellan, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Robert W. Minor, of Ohio, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1958.

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1957.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board, for the term expiring February 1, 1959.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

APPOINTMENT, EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be senior surgeons

John C. Hume
Emanuel E. Mandell

To be senior assistant surgeons

Joseph H. Davis
Carl S. Shultz
Robert B. Mellins
Arnold S. Morel
Jack Richard
Preston L. Leslie, Jr.
James H. McGee
Hildegard M. Leslie
Henry V. Belcher
Donald A. Carlyle
Frederick Stohlman, Jr
Roy J. Thurn
John E. Sonneland
Edward B. Cross
Warren P. Jurgensen

To be assistant surgeons

Neely E. Pardee
Gordon S. Siegel
John S. Murray, Jr.
Gabriel M. Mulcahy
Ralph J. Zecca
John G. Mahaney
Ted L. Flickinger
Donald J. Murray
James T. Worlton, Jr.

To be assistant dental surgeons

Robert A. Hesse
E. Duane Oakes

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Katharine W. Kendall
Marcella R. Hayes
Josephine I. O'Callaghan
Margurite M. Albrecht
Ruth P. Tweedale
Elizabeth B. Uroda
Lydia K. Oustaian
Catherine M. Thompson
Mary G. Eastlake
Lillian M. Kennedy
Hazel F. Kandler
Esther C. Gilbertson

To be assistant nurse officers

B. Octavia Heistad
Evelyn H. Kreuger
Dorothy C. Calafiore
Catherine M. Atwater

To be senior surgeon, effective date indicated

James D. Wharton, December 28, 1955.

To be surgeon, effective date indicated

I. Ray Howard, September 22, 1955.

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

Nicholas P. Sinaly, September 26, 1955.
Paul Ortega, Jr., October 3, 1955.
Jesse L. Steinfeld, October 3, 1955.
Robert Y. Katase, October 4, 1955.
Thomas L. Gorsuch, October 5, 1955.
Seymour Dubroff, October 5, 1955.
David J. Crosby, October 10, 1955.
Fred J. Payne, October 14, 1955.
Symon Satow, November 16, 1955.
M. Walter Johnson, November 26, 1955.
Edward F. Blasser, November 30, 1955.
Bernard J. Eggertsen, December 3, 1955.
Agamemnon Despopoulos, December 6, 1955.
Murray Goldstein, December 6, 1955.
Leo Nakayama, December 6, 1955.
Dewey C. MacKay, Jr., December 8, 1955.
Frank R. Mark, December 13, 1955.
Eugene T. van der Smissen, December 19, 1955.

To be assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

C. Lowell Edwards, September 7, 1955.
Roy E. Tolls, September 7, 1955.
Ernest E. Musgrave, September 7, 1955.
Michael W. Justice, November 28, 1955.
David H. Looff, December 7, 1955.
John R. Trautman, December 9, 1955.
Irvin B. Kaplan, December 14, 1955.
Thomas E. Kiester, December 19, 1955.

To be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective date indicated

Paul H. Keyes, September 22, 1955.
Harry M. Bohannan, September 23, 1955.
Alfred Popper, October 1, 1955.
Edgar M. Benjamin, October 3, 1955.
Marvin S. Burstone, October 3, 1955.
Edward J. McCarten, October 28, 1955.
Neville A. Booth, November 7, 1955.
Winston W. Frenzel, November 12, 1955.
Joseph Abramowitz, November 20, 1955.

To be assistant dental surgeons, effective date indicated

Robert R. Kelley, November 4, 1955.
Calvin M. Reed, November 16, 1955.
Winston D. Bowman, November 21, 1955.
W. Frederick Schmidt, November 25, 1955.
Stanley D. Sherriff, November 29, 1955.
Bernard A. Yenne, December 9, 1955.
James R. Dow, December 13, 1955.
William D. Bowker, December 19, 1955.
Harry H. Hatasaka, December 23, 1955.
Leonard Iverson, December 29, 1955.
Howard B. Hancock, December 29, 1955.
Ivan T. Shaurette, December 30, 1955.

To be senior scientist, effective date indicated

Louis Block, November 14, 1955.

To be senior assistant nurse officers, effective date indicated

Lucille T. Fallon, November 30, 1955.
Evelyn A. Eckberg, December 7, 1955.
Antoinette M. Antetomaso, December 8, 1955.
Elizabeth A. Mullen, December 8, 1955.
Helen Troxell, December 8, 1955.

To be assistant nurse officer, effective date indicated

Alice M. Haggerty, December 12, 1955.

To be junior assistant nurse officer, effective date indicated

Cecil F. Mills, December 12, 1955.

To be senior assistant sanitarian, effective date indicated

Viola L. Ziemer, October 18, 1955.

To be assistant sanitarians, effective date indicated

Grace M. Littlejohn, October 24, 1955.
Paul Blank, December 14, 1955.
Richard A. Steinmetz, December 14, 1955.

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

Malvern C. Holland, July 1, 1954.
Charles C. Elliott, July 1, 1955.
Charles A. Davis, July 1, 1955.
Robert W. Jones, July 1, 1955.
Cuvier D. McClure, July 1, 1955.
William B. Gaynor, July 1, 1955.
Leslie R. Schroeder, July 1, 1955.
Alan S. Rabson, July 4, 1955.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named persons for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey subject to qualification provided by law:

To be captains

Ira T. Sanders, effective January 1, 1956.
Edward R. McCarthy, effective January 1, 1956.
Clarence A. Burmister, effective January 1, 1956.
Francis B. Quinn, effective January 1, 1956.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Edwin T. Williams, St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Lawrenceville, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who controls the trackless nebulae and directs the courses of men and nature, we thank Thee for the countless blessings that are ours in a land of freedom, justice, and mercy; a land where the pursuit of happiness is a right, and service to our fellow men a privilege.

Guide and direct the august body assembled here today, helping each man to realize that the thoughts of his mind that come to final action as the law of our land will affect countless lives other than his own. And therefore the responsibility which is his must stem from a disciplined mind and an understanding heart which can best be his as he receives the directives of Thou, God Almighty.

Endue each one of these Members with a spirit of forbearance one for another that in all things they may put service to their country above considerations of self.

These things we humbly ask in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7871) entitled "An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. IVES, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. PAYNE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. HOEVEN of Iowa, Mr. MILLER of Maryland.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. NATCHER, of Kentucky; Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland; Mr. HAND, of New Jersey; Mr. JONAS, of North Carolina.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. BECKER, of New York.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GARY, of Virginia; Mr. NICHOLSON, of Massachusetts.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the birthday of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Through all the ages of history, freedom has advanced chiefly through the devotion and sacrifices of inspired patriots.

Tyranny never yields save to the stout heart of courage.

That is why all America joins today in honoring the 76th birthday of Douglas MacArthur. His whole life has been dedicated to freedom and human dignity under law.

His distinguished military service to the United States and her allies measured more than 50 years.

Since his retirement from active duty 5 years ago, he has carried on bravely as a proud and determined sentinel of the Republic. Never has he winced before treachery, nor cried aloud against personal humiliation. So long as the cause of freedom might be served by his own personal sacrifice, Douglas MacArthur has held a steady course against godless, world-wrecking communism.

Today he is honored by the true defenders of freedom in every quarter of the globe—for his military genius; for his inspiring moral leadership in the darkest hours of modern history; for his humble, noble character, and unflinching stout heart.

After Pearl Harbor, his masterful generalship throughout the entire Pacific theater—from Bataan to Australia, from New Guinea to Leyte, from Manila to Tokyo—clocked the fate and fortunes of freedom through almost 4 years of devastating war. He knew personally the darkest hours of defeat—but never despair. And he knew personally the great moment of triumph aboard the *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay on September 2, 1945—but never cruel exaltation or hateful revenge.

Save for the uncompromising valor of MacArthur and his heroic little band of fellow defenders at Pusan in 1950, the world tide of barbaric communism might by this time have rolled over all of Asia. Through the long corridors of history echoes faintly today the old slogan of surrender, "We planned it that way." But MacArthur did not plan it that way.

We do not yet know how much the world owes him for his indomitable courage and determination in that epochal crisis of freedom. Not only did his military genius ward off the fatal blow of a savage aggressor; his brilliant mind instantly encompassed the true nature of the conflict, and so steeled all the dominions of freedom for the decisive struggle. He understood at sight the real nature of the worldwide Communist conspiracy against peace and order, and suffered no man to distract him from freedom's crusade.

Through his whole life, he has demonstrated repeatedly a deep and abiding devotion to the Constitution of the United States.

Never has he compromised or sullied the high moral cause of America's quest for lasting peace with honor.

Nor has he ever betrayed freedom for the plaudits of traitors, spies, saboteurs, and degenerate fellow travelers.

Since time began, human history has moved in the lives of great men.

All the pages of history which tell the heroic life of Douglas MacArthur are bright with honor, courage, and sturdy Christian morality.

His life exemplifies the familiar adage of Theodore Roosevelt, "The old days were great because the men who lived in them had mighty qualities."

A fitting climax to a great career would be the passage of the resolution which I introduced to make MacArthur a general of the armies. It sleeps in the Committee on Armed Services. I hope it can be passed at this session.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 319)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the fifth annual report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1956.*

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, no one believes more firmly than I do in the doctrine of States rights—that is, the right of the sovereign States of the Union to manage their own internal affairs in all respects, except such as are expressly forbidden to them by the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, no one was more shocked than I at the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954. This decision, in effect, overturned at one fell swoop by judicial fiat doctrines and principles of constitutional law which had become a part of our Constitution by repeated adjudication. I firmly believe, and have always believed, that the States of the Union have a right to manage their internal affairs, and to legislate for the health, morals, and safety of their citizens in all matters which are not expressly forbidden to the States, and to the people of these States by the Constitution.

That is what the Founding Fathers meant when they said in the Bill of Rights:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. (Tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.)

The States of the Union which adopted and ratified the Constitution of the United States did not delegate to the Central Government of the United States the right to legislate, by statute or by judicial decree, with respect to the education of the children of the people of the several States. The States which proposed and ratified the Constitution of the United States did not delegate to the

United States the right and power to manage and direct the internal affairs of the people of the several States in matters that peculiarly affected the health, safety, and welfare of the people of those States under the varying conditions existing in the several States.

I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States for 41 years, and I know from my association with literally thousands of other Representatives from all the States of the Union, over these many years, that the doctrine of so-called States rights is not one peculiar to the beliefs of the people of my State and my section.

The people of the States of the Union which were not among the Thirteen Original States believe that they have the right to manage their own internal affairs just as much as do the people of Georgia and the other 12 original States.

I have given continual, serious, and mature consideration as to how the problems which confront us today should be met.

I have become convinced in my own mind that the problems should be met by the submission to the States and the adoption by the States of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will provide:

> Notwithstanding any other provision in this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, the States of the United States have, and shall forever have, the right to manage their own internal affairs with respect to any matter not expressly forbidden by the Constitution.

Therefore, I have today offered in the House of Representatives such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which I hope will be adopted in the same form and manner that the other 22 amendments to the Constitution have been adopted.

This amendment to my mind states the law as it really exists today and simply reaffirms principles of constitutional government which are as old as the Constitution itself.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the clerk:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: Pursuant to authority granted by section 8002 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 16, 1956, elect the Honorable NOBLE J. GREGORY, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, vice the Honorable John D. Dingell, deceased, to serve with the following other Members of the House who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas; DANIEL A. REED, of New York; and THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio.

Respectfully yours,

JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

MEDICAL RESEARCH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 320)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Nation in recent years has made notable advances in the unending struggle against disease and disability. Human suffering has been relieved, the span of man's years has been extended. But in the light of the human and economic toll still taken by disease, in the light of the great opportunities open before us, the Nation still has not summoned the resources it properly and usefully could summon to the cause of better health.

Therefore, as a nation, we must now take further steps to improve the health of the people. This further effort, funds for which have been included in the budget submitted to the Congress, should be a characteristically American partnership—a partnership in which private and governmental enterprise are joined to advance the national welfare. The important role of the Federal Government is to provide assistance without interference in personal, local, or State responsibilities.

Such action should be taken in several general areas through—

A substantial increase in Federal funds for medical research.

A new program of grants for construction of medical research and training facilities.

Further steps to help alleviate health personnel shortages.

Measures which will help our people meet the costs of medical care.

Action to strengthen certain other basic health services throughout the Nation.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Progress in medicine is dependent upon research. Intensive studies by thousands of scientists have been responsible for important advances in recent years against such major afflictions as rheumatic fever, epilepsy, high blood pressure, poliomyelitis, and blindness.

The development of antibiotics has had a major share in bringing about dramatic reductions during the past 10 years in the death toll from many other diseases—for example, tuberculosis, 75 percent; appendicitis, 69 percent; acute rheumatic fever, 66 percent.

The widespread use of the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine within the past year alone has proved highly effective in reducing the threat of paralytic poliomyelitis to many of our children.

Yet much remains unknown. Despite progress in the control of cancer, its cause remains a dark mystery. Little is known about the diseases of the nervous system. Much remains to be discovered about heart disease and mental illness.

In order to facilitate the expansion of medical research I have, therefore, proposed in the budget submitted to the Congress an appropriation to the Public Health Service for the National Institutes of Health of $126,525,000, an increase of 28 percent over the total funds appropriated for the present fiscal year.

This program is designed to give major emphasis—through an increased share of funds—to basic research. For basic research—in the biological and medical sciences—underlies all medical progress. Through increased emphasis on these fundamental studies we bring into better balance the total medical research effort.

The appropriation I have recommended would provide a substantial increase in funds in various categories of research. The program would provide funds as follows: For cancer, $32,437,000; heart disease, $22,106,000; mental illness, $21,749,000; arthritis and metabolic diseases, $13,345,000; neurology and blindness, $12,196,000; infectious and parasitic diseases, $9,799,000; dental disorders, $2,971,000; and $11,922,000 for the general research programs of the National Institutes of Health.

The increased funds recommended would be expended in part at the laboratories of the National Institutes of Health. But by far the major share of the increased funds would be for research grants to medical schools, hospitals, and private laboratories. Funds for these research grants would be increased by 47 percent over this year's appropriation.

The increase of $7 million recommended for research grants by the National Science Foundation would provide for additional research in the biological and medical sciences.

These programs would permit a broader and more intensive scientific effort to develop the fundamental knowledge necessary to a better understanding of illness and to apply that knowledge more rapidly to relieve human suffering.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING FACILITIES

The bulk of medical research is conducted in laboratories of universities, hospitals, and other institutions outside the Federal Government. These institutions also provide the intellectual environment for training the scientists upon whom successful research depends. And they provide the training ground for medical practitioners.

Physical facilities of medical research and teaching institutions are inadequate to meet the human needs of the Nation. As we strive to achieve better health for the people we must help to provide the needed laboratories and teaching facilities.

I, therefore, recommend that Congress enact legislation authorizing $250 million for a 5-year program to assist in construction of research and teaching facilities for schools of medicine, osteopathy, public health, and dentistry, and other research institutions. These institutions would be required to supply at least equal amounts in matching funds.

HEALTH PERSONNEL

The rate at which physicians are being graduated from the Nation's medical schools is barely keeping pace with the

increase in population. There are serious shortages in such specialized fields as psychiatry, pediatrics, and in physical medicine and rehabilitation. Relative to population, the number of dentists and nurses is diminishing. The aging of our population and the increase in the incidence of chronic disease, the anticipated continued growth of voluntary health insurance plans, and the general expansion of our economy—all will tend to increase the demand for health services.

The increase in funds which I have requested for the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation will permit a major increase in trainees and research fellows. The program of construction grants for medical research and teaching facilities also offers the opportunity for medical, dental, and other professional schools to expand their student capacity and provide for the training of more physicians, scientists, dentists, and other health workers.

As additional Federal aid in meeting the problem of existing personnel shortages in the health field, I recommend to the Congress, as was proposed in my health message of last year, enactment of legislation to provide for (a) a 5-year program of grants for training practical nurses, (b) traineeships for graduate nurses, and (c) authority to establish traineeships in other public health specialties.

MEETING THE COST OF MEDICAL CARE

Since World War II the costs of medical care have been increasingly met through voluntary health insurance. More than 100 million persons are now enrolled in prepayment health insurance plans of some type. But health insurance coverage is still not available to many who need it, and the character and amount of insurance protection in important respects remains inadequate.

Health insurance protection must be made more available to older persons and those living in rural areas, to the self-employed and those working in small organizations who cannot be reached through ordinary group enrollment methods. There is particular need for much broader coverage against the cost of long term or other especially expensive illness, which can be a financial catastrophe for many families.

The need for more and better health insurance coverage can best be met by building on what many of our people have already provided for themselves—the voluntary health prepayment plans. Much can be done to encourage more rapid expansion and improvement of such plans.

Last year and the year before I urged enactment of a proposal for Federal reinsurance to encourage increased protection against the cost of medical care through voluntary prepayment plans. Since the legislation was introduced, private insurance organizations have developed new types of policies and prepayment plans and have extended coverage to groups formerly unprotected. There are now indications that the organizations writing health prepayment plans might progress more rapidly by joining together—sharing or pooling their risks—to offer broader benefits and expanded coverage on reasonable terms in fields of special needs. The administration is considering legislative proposals which would permit such pooling. But, if practical and useful methods cannot be developed along these lines, then I will again urge enactment of the proposal made last year.

Illness and disability are among the principal problems of public assistance recipients, and are major causes of dependency. Therefore, I again recommend that the Congress authorize a separate program through which the Federal Government would match funds expended by the States and localities for medical care for the indigent aged, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled, and dependent children.

Additionally, I renew my previous recommendations for (a) providing Federal employees with the benefits of group health insurance, and (b) the improvement of medical care for the dependents of servicemen.

STRENGTHENING BASIC HEALTH SERVICES

Expansion of medical research, financial assistance for construction of research and teaching facilities, measures to increase research and health manpower, and steps to help meet the costs of medical care are essential to national progress toward better health. It is equally essential that other public health services be strengthened and improved.

I present the following further proposals for consideration by the Congress:

Sickness surveys: Information on the nature and extent of sickness and disability is neither accurate nor up to date. The last comprehensive survey of illness in the Nation was made 20 years ago. Since then American medicine has experienced the most rapid and dramatic changes in its history. Improved statistical data are essential as a guide for research and for the effective planning and operation of health programs.

I urge the Congress, therefore, to authorize the Public Health Service to secure periodically needed information on the incidence, duration, and effects of illness and disability in the Nation.

Expansion of medical care facilities: The Federal-State program of aid in the construction of hospitals and other medical care facilities was broadened in 1954 to give greater emphasis to the construction of chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities.

I recommend the extension for 2 more years of this program, which otherwise would terminate in 1957. I have also proposed in my budget message a $19 million increase in funds to expand construction of these needed facilities.

I again urge the enactment of the proposal I made last year for Federal insurance of mortgage loans made by private lending institutions for the construction of hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and other types of private medical care facilities. This proposal follows the pattern developed in successful Government guaranty programs in other fields.

Indian health program: As an important step toward improving health conditions among our Indian population, I recommend legislation which will authorize the Public Health Service to construct and maintain urgently needed sanitary facilities for our Indian population. For the total Indian health program, I propose a substantial increase in the funds of the Public Health Service.

Mental illness: Mental illness is one of our most serious national problems. Last year I recommended authorization of a new program of mental health project grants. The purpose of this program was to seek ways of improving the quality of care in mental institutions, of improving the administration of these institutions, and, most importantly, of reducing the length of stay in these institutions. I again urge that the Congress authorize this program.

Water and air pollution: Problems of water pollution control grow more pressing with population growth and with industrial development and expansion. The present Water Pollution Control Act expires on June 30 of this year. I again recommend that the authority in this act be strengthened and placed on a permanent basis. This would enable the Public Health Service to help the States and industry to deal effectively with the problems of pollution control.

I have also recommended a substantial increase in funds to broaden the research attack on problems of air pollution by non-Federal institutions and by the Public Health Service and other Government agencies. This will also permit a step-up in technical assistance to States for the control of pollution.

Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act: Last year Congress approved an appropriation of Federal funds to assist the States in providing free poliomyelitis vaccine for many of our children and expectant mothers. This program expires February 15. I have recommended an extension to June 30, 1957, and an appropriation of $30 million to complete this program.

Increased support for Food and Drug Administration: Last year a committee of distinguished citizens made a thoughtful study and presented numerous recommendations for strengthening and improving the Food and Drug Administration in its important work of protecting the American consumer. I have recommended a significant increase in funds for the Food and Drug Administration to provide for an initial expansion of its inspection and related technical staff.

Public health aspects of civil defense: The skills and resources of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration will be of great value to the Nation in dealing with any civil defense emergency that may arise. The Federal Civil Defense Administration has delegated vital responsibilities to these agencies, and I have included funds in the budget to strengthen research on the public health aspects of civil defense.

Vocational rehabilitation: The Congress in 1954 authorized an expansion of the Federal contribution to the Federal-State program of restoring handicapped men and women to more productive lives. I have recommended the funds needed to continue expansion of this program.

Veterans' medical program: The medical care of our veterans remains a grow-

ing responsibility, and in the next fiscal year the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration will have an average daily load of 111,500 patients. I have included in the budget a request for $53 million for construction and improvements at Veterans' Administration facilities, about one-half of which is for replacement of old hospitals.

CONCLUSION

The Congress has enacted enlightened and progressive legislation during recent years which represents substantial gains in the unending war against disease and disability.

I now urge the Congress to give continued support to the quest for better health. The proposals I have submitted call for a proper distribution of responsibility among the many groups which make up the health services of the Nation—health professions, educational institutions, foundations, industry, and all levels of government.

The role of the Federal Government in this great effort is that of a partner. The Federal Government should support the efforts of the States and communities and private agencies. It should encourage the individual initiative and industry inherent in our free society. The specific measures which I have placed before you are conceived in terms of these basic American principles; they provide promise for a renewed and reinvigorated attack on our health problems.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1956.*

OBSERVANCE OF WILLIAM McKINLEY'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the older Members of the Congress will appreciate what I am about to do when they see the carnations in the lapels of many Members because every year for about 20 years we have taken a few minutes to observe the birthday of former President McKinley, and to show our respect for him—a great Congressman and a great President. I am proud that I had the opportunity to join with others when we first initiated this program of recognizing McKinley's birthday and I am proud to say that it has proven to be very popular.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, it shall not be my purpose to consume all the time allotted to me, for there are other Members here who would like to speak and we would like to have them speak. However, I would like to say that the reason we feel that we should observe McKinley Day at this time is because McKinley's birthday will be on the 29th of January which is next Sunday and we could not observe it any better at any time than today. We maintain that probably the greatest work that McKinley ever did was done right here on this floor and in this House of Representatives. I remember Mr. William Tyler Page, who was a great American and was for many years the Clerk of the House of Representatives, used to tell me that McKinley sat right over here to my right. In those days they had individual desks. William McKinley was a Congressman and was considered one of the leaders of the House. He was the author of the historic McKinley protective tariff laws.

I remember that there was a very distinguished Democrat leader from Texas who served with him and who contested with him in many instances. Between them there was an unbreakable friendship in spite of the fact that they contested against each other most of the time. McKinley was a national figure who was loved by his friends and was respected by everyone who knew him. We are proud to ask you to observe the anniversary of his birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more at this time, but with your permission, I shall yield such time as he may desire to Representative MINSHALL who is now the Representative from the district adjoining the district that Mr. McKinley represented most ably.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor for me to join with my distinguished colleagues in praise of that great statesman, William McKinley.

As a new Member of Congress this is the first opportunity I have had to associate my remarks with such true Americans as TOM JENKINS, CLARENCE BROWN, and my many other good friends in the Ohio delegation. As an Ohioan, this day does not present the first occasion on which I have given my humble tribute to the 25th President of these United States.

All Ohioans are proud of their heritage, and each year at this time Ohioans, in and out of the Congress, are particularly mindful of a cornerstone of this heritage—the deeds, the actions, the spirit of William McKinley.

I had not yet been born when President McKinley was shot on September 6, 1901, by an anarchist while attending the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo. But from my early childhood, I can remember the stories my father would tell in admiration of this man who contributed so much to my heritage as an Ohioan—who contributed so much to the well-being of my country.

William McKinley was a statesman.

He served here in the House of Representatives, and today students of American history tell of the many pieces of legislation which bear his name.

As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, he, like our former chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], contributed immensely to the economic security of our Nation. He promoted the tariff which to him was a national policy and not a cloak for special privilege to favored interests.

This philosophy of McKinley established a criterion for us to follow—no one of us feels that the tariff is designed for the special privilege of a single industry, but rather we know that our tariff structure is designed more specifically to protect our working people against the low wages and substandard labor conditions of foreign countries.

He was known among the foremost orators of the House. His stentorian voice championed the cause of the wage-earner in the solution of labor troubles. His words in support of the civil-service laws came out loud and clear.

William McKinley also served as Governor of Ohio.

During his term of office in the statehouse of Columbus, Ohio, William McKinley's deeds exemplified what historians have called his trait of friendly humanitarianism. He constantly worked toward increasing harmony between labor and management and he personally directed the relief work for the starving miners of Ohio's Hocking Valley district.

Americans remember William McKinley best, however, in his role as statesman-President of the United States.

It was William McKinley who led a bankrupt nation into an era of prosperity and abundance.

It was McKinley who, after defeating a Democrat administration, restored the American ideology of minimum Federal interference with the daily lives of our citizens.

It was William McKinley who selected men of stature to serve in his administration—John Hay, Secretary of State; Elihu Root, Secretary of War; Philander C. Knox, Attorney General; Theodore Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy; William Howard Taft, Commissioner of the Philippines—all names which reflect glory and ability in the annals of time.

It was William McKinley who led this Nation to victory in a war which he deplored. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, President McKinley left the decision to enter this war where it rightfully belonged—in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

It was William McKinley who, at the end of this war, took the United States from a backseat at the family table of nations and placed her in the forefront as an international power.

The administration of William McKinley was the beginning of a new period in world history.

William McKinley was also a politician in the true sense of the profession. He was artful—honest—successful.

Three times, the Democrats attempted to gerrymander William McKinley out of his seat in the House of Representatives. Only once did they succeed, although on one other occasion a Democrat-controlled House of Representatives unseated him because he had been elected and certified by a slim plurality of just eight votes.

An insidious premeditated campaign of smear and deceit failed to defeat William McKinley in his bid for reelection as Governor of Ohio.

He was a politician; an astute and adroit politician.

He was permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention in 1888, and he had previously served in other high capacities within the Republican Party.

When it came time for him to seek the Presidential nomination, he enlisted the services of the most expert political

manager of our century, the eminent Mark Hanna, of Cleveland.

Together, they waged a campaign for the Presidency which has no equal in our history. While his eloquent rival, William Jennings Bryan, toured the country, McKinley remained in imperturbable dignity at his old home in Canton where he made over 300 speeches to more than 750,000 visitors.

The results were not only successful in terms of victory, he was the first President in 24 years to be elected by a popular majority.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor for me to join with my colleagues in praise of William McKinley for it is a particular privilege to honor a great statesman, a true politician, a revered citizen of this arena of democracy. I am proud my home is in Ohio, the home of William McKinley.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the contributions of the late President William McKinley to the progress of our country are a matter of history. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] very well said during his very appropriate and touching remarks that William McKinley made his great record in this very body, in the National House of Representatives. He meant by that that the character of service he rendered in this body attracted him to the attention of the people of the country, as a consequence of which his party honored him and he was elected by the people and served with the distinction and ability as history records as the Chief Executive of our country.

It is well that we pause on the birthday of one who occupied the highest office within the gift of our people, the most powerful office in the world, to reflect not so much about the man as an individual but what he symbolized and what he represented in terms of putting into operation in his life for the benefit of our people the fundamentals of our Government and the ideals in which we believe.

The late President William McKinley was a man, as history shows, of deep faith, of great ideals, and with an intense love of the fundamentals of our country.

By pausing as we do to pay tribute to the memory of William McKinley, and on other occasions of other Presidents who have passed into the great beyond, we render a service of benefit not only to ourselves but to the people of the United States.

It is well for us to pause once in a while and engage in reflection on the great services and contributions of men like William McKinley, on the great honor it is to be an American citizen, and how few have had the honor of being elected by the people as the Chief Executive of our great Nation. No matter how much I might disagree on some particular matter with anyone who occupies the White House, I know that whoever that occupant is or may be, he has the noblest of motives and the best of intentions in doing anything he thinks is in the best interest of our country. I might disagree as to the policy, but I would never impugn the nobility of motive. History shows that William McKinley was a man with nobility of character whose motives in connection with the national interest of our country lived up to the highest ideals of his great office. I congratulate—not my Republican friends, but my American friends—my American friends on the Republican side for pausing today and paying this tribute to one of our great Americans.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a minute of my time, with your permission, to comment on what my friend, the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, had to say. You know Mr. McKinley was like many other men, a many sided man. He was a great soldier, a dynamic fighting soldier. The record shows that there has been erected on one of the famous battlefields of the Civil War a large monument as a testimonial of his valor and his courage as manifested on that battlefield. He was recognized by those who fought on his side and by those who fought on the other side. Even though he was a fighting soldier he was a kindly man and he was loved for the way he treated people. You know it has been said of one great man, one of the greatest figures of all times, that the little children cried in the streets when he died. Well, when McKinley died, it has been said of him that the little children cried in the streets, for he was loved by all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, along with my good colleagues from the State of Ohio, and the majority leader, I am privileged to join with them in paying tribute to the great 25th President of the United States, William McKinley. When I first came to the Congress and for the first time I saw the red carnation appear on each coat lapel I wondered just what it meant. I immediately learned its significance. I am glad that this great Congress has made this observance of President McKinley's birthday a part and parcel of great tradition of Congress itself, when we pay tribute to this great American for the service to our country not only in this House of Representatives but as Governor of the State of Ohio and as President of the United States of America.

Last year, it was my privilege to speak in Niles, Ohio, where McKinley was born, at the annual banquet held in commemoration of this great President. In my studies preparatory to what I might say on that particular occasion, I delved a little into the life of President McKinley and the history of his days. I learned many things that I did not know, and the more I learned, the greater he became. Not until such time as I came in contact with the individual citizenry of Ohio and visited with them personally, did I really understand the deep love and great respect the people of Ohio rightfully have for this great American. His life was an inspiring one. He lived and worked for God and country. He did much, not only for the State of Ohio, but for the benefit of all mankind.

I have often thought that one of the great pleasures of serving in this House of Representatives is the privilege of meeting with so many inspiring men and women from all parts of the country dedicated to service of our country. Those who have served and now serve in this body must recognize that McKinley, as a Member of Congress, set an example here that we could emulate, and we would doubtless serve well the people we represent were we to follow his principles.

By our words here today we all pay our respects to a truly great American. Let us by our deeds in our personal and official life contribute, as McKinley did, each in his way, to the betterment of our country and the betterment of life itself.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take only a moment to say that the red carnation was Mr. McKinley's favorite flower, and out of respect for Mr. McKinley the red carnation has been selected to be the State flower of Ohio. It is likely that in a few days the Democratic Members of the House will observe the birthday of Mr. Roosevelt and will use the white carnation as their flower.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and also that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

GEORGE SANFORD HOLMES

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on August 20 of last year, death brought an untimely end to the journalistic career of my dear friend, George Sanford Holmes. His career stretched over half a century of service ranging from reporter to managing editor, correspondent to columnist, author to director of information for Government agencies. He authored 2 books, 1 of poetry, and wrote a column for the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain. Thirteen years of this career was spent as Washington correspondent and he served with distinction for this time as a member of the House and Senate press galleries and his name and work is familiar to many Members of this Chamber. I will cover his career in more detail in a separate statement but at this time I should like to read a poem written by Mr. Holmes.

WITH A SMILE

(By George Sanford Holmes, July 29, 1955)

Time is the seneschal who guards the key
That locks us in the prison cell of earth,

To which we all are sentenced at our birth
Till death at last shall set us free.

From stark oblivion each soul doth bloom
Into this fleeting heritage of light,
Nor does it know, when it shall take its flight
If it return to glory—or to gloom.

Yet if this life itself be interlude,
This ancient planet but a stopping place,
'Tis here that God endows us with His grace
And bids us face the unknown with a smile.

Later events show that this poem, written less than a month before his death, was his own last look at life. Its simple faith and moving beauty can remain as an inspiration to those of us who have not yet seen dimly into the land beyond. May it remain as a memorial to him.

WORKING WIDOWS BILL

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would make a limited but much-needed improvement in our tax law and, at the same time, give simple justice to many deserving families now unfairly burdened. As the law now stands, widows with dependent children receiving social-security benefits are subject to an excessive and, I believe, unintended tax liability. The burden is not, in fact, imposed on families in comfortable circumstances; but it falls with a vengeance on those least able to bear it, families with incomes already at or below the marginal level.

How this happens is clear. Although survivor's benefits received by dependent children are tax free, they are considered when determining dependency. In order to demonstrate that she provides more than half her children's support—as she must for tax credit—a widow has to prove that she has spent on her children from her own income, more than the total social-security benefits received. For instance, if a child receives $500 in benefits, the parent must prove that she spent $501 of her own or lose the dependency exemption. This is no burden for the prosperous parent. But it may be an impossible demand on the low-income widow and one that results in her paying hundreds of hard-to-spare dollars in additional taxes.

Congress has already, in the 1954 revision of the Internal Revenue Code, recognized the special claim of the family with a child in college; we have provided that scholarships received by the child shall not be considered in calculating whether, for tax purposes, the parent furnishes more than half the child's support. I have no quarrel with this provision; indeed, it has my wholehearted approval. But how much more deserving is the parallel case of the widow who, far from sending her children to college, is hard put to provide her youngsters even a decent living.

Present provisions of tax law, I therefore submit, are in need of revision to correct this inequity because: (a) they permit dependency deductions to the well-to-do parent and to the parent with children in college but tend to deny it to a particularly deserving group, working widows with small children who are forced to live on a modest and often inadequate budget; (b) the effect in such cases is to burden the needy family with an added tax of up to $120 per child; a tax which, for practical purposes, occurs because of the social-security benefit and therefore contradicts the intent of Congress in making such benefits tax-exempt.

How heavy the burden thus imposed is, for widows with small children, is well illustrated by the statistics. There are in the United States nearly 2 million children whose fathers are dead. Over half of them receive social-security benefits which average from $24 to $52 a month per child. In the vast majority of cases these benefits, while of vital help, are by no means adequate for the full support of the child. The mother must still bear a substantial share of the load.

Yet widows with dependent children, as a group, have incomes far from bountiful for such support. While the average American family, in 1954, had an income of $4,173, families headed by women had incomes averaging only $2,293. Three-fourths of all such families had incomes of less than $4,000 a year. It is the widows heading such families, rearing children on substandard resources, who are penalized by present tax law.

How serious the tax impact can be is shown by a simple example: Consider 2 widows, each with 2 small children and with each child receiving $600 a year in benefits. The needy working widow, with earned income of $2,000 a year is confronted by a dilemma. To provide more than half her children's support, under these circumstances would leave her for all other purposes only $800, an obviously impossible alternative. Yet if she cannot prove that she provides more than half their support (or at least $601 a year per child) she cannot claim them as dependents and her tax bill goes up $238, a serious loss to such a family.

By contrast, the widow with $5,000 a year has no problem. She can easily prove that she contributes the necessary $601 to the support of each child and still have $3,800 for other purposes. So the dependency claim saves her $254 in taxes. It is the needy family that bears the burden while the better off family benefits from substantial tax relief.

I have spoken at length because I am convinced of the injustice in the present operation of the law and of the simplicity and economy with which this injustice can be corrected. My bill provides that in determining whether the widow furnishes more than half the child's support, for dependency tax claim purposes, up to $600 per child in benefits may be excluded from consideration. This provision is similar to the present "scholarship" exclusion; it gives direct and substantial relief to the needy—and only the needy. Though its precise effect cannot be determined, a rough estimate indicates that it might benefit 40 to 45,000 families with 80 to 90,000 children; its cost would probably not exceed $8 or $9 million in tax revenue loss. It would be hard to imagine a more substantial and deserved benefit at lower cost.

I realize that pressure on the Congress to recognize special hardship cases in the tax law is great. But this is a case whose claim to consideration has exceptional merit. Let me summarize the important considerations:

First. The bill is simple and self-administering; in the nature of the case, relief is limited to the needy family. There is no problem of administration, no problem of determining need, no loophole.

Second. It provides substantial relief to a group whose need and right is unquestionable, at a minimal loss of tax revenue.

Third. It restores the intent of Congress and internal consistency to the tax law by eliminating what is, for practical purposes, a tax on social-security benefits.

Fourth. In brief, practical as well as humanitarian considerations make this a form of badly needed and thoroughly justified relief to widows who must work to support their young children.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF INDIA

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Congress I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference. Today is the sixth anniversary of the independence of India, and I rise to felicitate that country.

I would like to congratulate the people of India, His Excellency Dr. Rajendra Prasad, president of India, His Excellency Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister, and His Excellency Gaganvihari Lalubhai Mehta, Ambassador of India to the United States, on the occasion of the celebration of the sixth anniversary of the proclamation of the Indian Republic, January 26, 1955.

Free India is a young nation which has passed through many trials and tribulations during this infancy of her freedom. India has reason to be thankful for this achievement of freedom and for the many other achievements that stand to the credit of her people. The record of the courage, hard work and the sacrifice with which the people of the Republic of India have faced and overcome many of its perils during these brief years since independence must not be belittled nor forgotten. Freedom brings

responsibility and can only be sustained by self-discipline, hard work, and the spirit of a free people.

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in his many speeches published in Independence and After, has boldly set forth a vital program of action for his country:

We have to find ourselves again and go back to the free India of our dreams. We have to rediscover the old values and place them in the new setting of a free India. * * * So let us be rid of everything that limits us and degrades us. Let us cast out fear and communualism and provincialism. Let us build up a free and democratic India, where the interest of the masses of our people has always the first place to which all other interests must submit.

Freedom has no meaning unless it brings relief to these masses from their many burdens. Democracy means tolerance, tolerance not merely of those who agree with us, but of those who do not agree with us. With the coming of freedom our patterns of behavior must change also so as to fit in with this freedom.

There is conflict and there are rumors of greater conflict in India and all over the world. We have to be ready for every emergency and contingency. When the Nation is in peril the first duty of every citizen is to give his or her service to the Nation without fear or expectation of reward. * * * I want to say to all the nations of the world * * * that we stand for peace and friendship with them. * * * The only war that we want to fight with all our might is the war against poverty and all its unhappy brood.

* * * Inflation and rising prices and unemployment oppress the people. * * * We have the care of vast numbers of our brothers and sisters who have suffered untold hardship and have been driven away from their homes to seek a new life elsewhere.

It is this war we have to fight, the war against economic crisis and to rehabilitate the disinherited. In this war there is no hatred or violence but only service to our country and our people. In this war every Indian can be a soldier. This is no time for individuals or groups to think of a narrow self-interest, forgetting the larger good. This is no time for wrangling or the spirit of faction.

And so I appeal to all my countrymen and countrywomen who have the love of India in their hearts and the passion to raise her masses, to cast aside the barriers that separate them and to join together in this historic and magnificent task worthy of a great people.

To all those in our services, civil and military, I would appeal for a single-minded devotion to the cause of India and for integrity, hard work, efficiency, and impartiality. He who fails in this at this critical hour, fails in his duty to India and her people.

To the youth of the country I would make a special appeal for they are the leaders of tomorrow and on them will be cast the burden of upholding India's honor and freedom.

My generation is a passing one, and soon we shall hand over the bright torch of India, which embodies her great and eternal spirit, to younger hands and stronger arms. May they hold it aloft, undimmed and untarnished, so that its light reaches every home and brings faith and courage and well-being to our masses.

His Excellency Rajendra Prasad, President of the Republic of India in his Republic Day message released today, rightfully lauded the strides India has made in the sphere of material progress at home and in enhancing the prestige of the nation abroad:

India is about to emerge from one important phase of planned development and the draft of the second plan is ready and its implementation is to be taken in hand a few months hence. The first 5-year plan has been a great success and in nearly all spheres of nation building and constructive departments, we have been able to reach the targets aimed at * * * I am glad to say that the countryside is gradually undergoing a great change for the better. * * * In respect of agriculture, education, public health, sanitation, and communications, our villages are steadily improving.

Prime Minister Nehru in his Republic Day message to the people of India on January 26, 1956, again reminds his people of the task before them:

Long years ago we took the pledge of independence. We redeemed that pledge. Let us, on this Republic Day, take another pledge to work for the unity of India and the progress of our people * * * a pledge which necessarily implies tolerance and cooperation, whatever the circumstances and provocation.

It is our manifest destiny to build up this new and united India and raise the standards of our people so that each one of us might have full and equal opportunities of progress. To the realization of that destiny we will dedicate ourselves anew on this day.

Broadcasting to the Indian nation on the sixth anniversary of the Indian Republic, President Rajendra Prasad called upon the people of India to dedicate themselves to the great cause of helping to maintain world peace.

Reviewing India's foreign policy, Dr. Prasad said:

The policy of peaceful coexistence and noninvolvement in war, which our Prime Minister has been so ably advocating, has this year won more adherents in Asia and Europe. It is not in an expansionist spirit that I have mentioned it. One should feel happy if the sphere of the areas pledged to the principles of peaceful coexistence widens so as to include in it as many countries as possible.

India has constantly voiced her devotion to a policy of nonviolence and peaceful coexistence. The major issue facing India and the United States today is increasing good-will. Other questions such as aid to India will naturally flow along with the widening channels of the spirit of good will. I hope for Indian union and progress and prosperity as she embarks upon a new year of independence. The Government of the Republic of India promises there will be no resting for any one until they redeem their pledge in full, until they make all the people of India what destiny intended them to be.

To India I send greetings and pledge myself to cooperate with them in furthering peace, freedom, and democracy.

ADDITIONAL BANKING FACILITIES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will give to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the right to determine whether or not any additional banking facilities are needed in the District of Columbia and, if so, to authorize them.

The District of Columbia is the only place in the continental United States where bankers do not have a choice of being either a national bank or a State bank. The result is that the Comptroller of the Currency is in a position to effectively throttle bank competition in the city of Washington. The effectiveness of his control is best evidenced by the fact that there has not been a single new bank chartered within the District since 1934. Only 17 banks are permitted to operate in the District of Columbia. Nine of them are national banks. Eight are operating under old charters issued before the enactment of the National Banking Act.

Like the rest of our country, during the last 20 years, the District has had a phenomenal growth, not only population-wise but industry- and business-wise. There is every reason why the District of Columbia should be permitted to have its local officials and residents determine the question of the chartering of new banks, and the establishment of branch banks within its territory.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 7871

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 7871.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit on Monday during general debate during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ATTACK ON THE TVA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the present administration, having learned nothing from the fate of the Dixon-Yates contract, is continuing its relentless and vengeful attack on the TVA.

I wish to point out to the men in the White House and the Bureau of the Budget that the real victims of these attacks, if they are successful in destroying the TVA, will not be the TVA itself, but the millions of men and women of the great TVA service area.

The current attack is two-pronged. The first would force the TVA to return to the Treasury the Federal investment in its power facilities at an accelerated rate beyond any conception of prudence.

The TVA at present is returning the national investment in its power facilities at a substantial rate. Its record in this respect could not have been better.

President Eisenhower has now ordered the return of these funds at a rate more than double that of the past. The bankers in this administration know that repayment at the rate the President is now demanding will promptly siphon off the lifeblood of the TVA. They fully intend to do so.

The other attack lies in the refusal of the President to ask for any funds for further development of power facilities. He knows that the TVA is almost to the limit of production with present facilities and those which the Congress has already provided. A power shortage already threatens. It is certain to come if additional facilities are not provided.

A power shortage in the TVA area would put a firm halt to the growth of every business enterprise in the TVA area.

Instead of the abundance of power by which business and industry have grown, by which our farms have achieved the magnificent results of electrification, and by which our households have become leaders in the use of electricity, we would soon be facing power rationing.

The victims of the President and the Budget Bureau, as I have said, would be the people of the TVA service area including a substantial part of my own district.

The President says that he is not seeking funds for new facilities because a self-financing plan for the TVA is underway in the Congress.

The self-financing plan for the TVA has not been reported out by the committees of either the House or the Senate. Even if a satisfactory plan is perfected by the Congress in this session, it will take at least a year to get it working, in my judgment.

President Eisenhower is placing the cart before the horse in this matter. There is no question but that appropriations for the completion of TVA facilities will be required this year. I will certainly do all in my power to obtain them. A year's lag in the construction of facilities will endanger the growth of the TVA area.

If this administration succeeds in killing or damaging the TVA, in spite of the pledges which President Eisenhower once made to the people of the TVA area, it will be an act of treachery unparalleled by any administration.

PERSECUTING THE FARMER

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think I would rather talk to the Republicans for the moment, because our Democratic friends, while professing great sympathy in this election year for the farmer, will not join us in trying to do something for him.

I know that in Michigan and some other States, the United States district attorney is prosecuting the farmer where he grew too much wheat according to the administrative directive; and although he fed it to his cattle or his chickens they are making him pay a fine or sending him to jail.

They are prosecuting one man because he exceeded the quota, although his excess was only $26. In another case where a farmer's income was around $1,300 they are trying to penalize him close to $1,000.

I cannot understand why the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], when he has had so much over the years for tobacco and peanuts, and after he had his picture taken with Walter Reuther—who too is all for the farmer—I cannot understand why he will not take it out of the pigeonhole on his committee desk the bill introduced by our colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

INJUSTICES OF CERTAIN FARM QUOTA POLICIES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the bill H. R. 8751. This bill is a companion bill to H. R. 1834 introduced a year ago by my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. It would amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to permit farmers to use the grain and wheat that they have raised on their own farms to feed their own stock.

It is an amazing thing to me, Mr. Speaker, that this law has remained on the statute books for such a long time.

This is not socialism; this is pure communism of the very highest and most refined type.

I certainly hope that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will see fit to take these bills under consideration within a very short period of time and that they will be passed. It is certainly hard on the farmers of the Northeast who are the ones who suffer most from this law and who are the ones who invariably have been treated as stepchildren by the Committee on Agriculture.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JANUARY 30

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he will kindly inform us as to the tentative program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to comply with the gentleman's request.

On Monday there will be a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 8780, which is an amendment to the Revenue Code relating to the gasoline tax in certain respects as far as the farmers are concerned. There probably will be a rollcall on this bill.

Then there will be consideration of a resolution reported by the Committee on House Administration making available to the Committee on Un-American Activities the necessary funds for this session, and probably some other similar resolutions from the Committee on House Administration.

On Tuesday we will call up the bill H. R. 6274, reported by the Committee on the Armed Services. This has to do with certain fees charged for discharge papers.

On Wednesday there will be called up for consideration the bill H. R. 7540, relating to the sale of certain housing projects.

The program for the balance of the week is at this time undetermined. Any further change in program I will announce as early as possible for the information of the Members.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman if he has any information as to the possibility of the school construction legislation being considered?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that now. The Committee on Rules is still considering that matter. There are quite a number of witnesses to be heard. I am unable, as I say, to give any information about that now. I do not want to be bound by this statement. The probabilities are that if a rule is reported it will not be reported in time for consideration of that bill next week. However, I do not want to be bound by that statement.

Mr. ARENDS. That is all right. One more question. The gentleman announced the possibility of a rollcall on Monday. Inasmuch as a number of the Members from Ohio contemplate being at home in connection with McKinley exercises, could we not put off a rollcall until Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair request. The Members are away for a definite purpose. The leadership wants to be as considerate as it is humanly possible considering the problems confronting all Members, but unless there is some justifiable reason for postponing, as I would like to personally, I cannot very well do so because these things become contagious. However, in this case the Members are away on matters of import, such as banquets in connection with commemorating the memory of one of our Presidents, and it therefore seems to

me that is a justifiable element for consideration. Under the circumstances that should be done. If there is a rollcall on Monday I shall ask that further consideration of the bill or the rollcall be postponed until Tuesday.

In other words the answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes."

ESTABLISHING A DOMESTIC RELATIONS BRANCH IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1289) to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1289, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to present to the House today, in behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, S. 1289, a bill which will establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, your committee considered this bill rather extensively. We held hearings on various occasions that lasted over a period of several days. There is a lot of interest in this matter in the District of Columbia, and we heard many witnesses. We heard from people who are well and highly respected in the District of Columbia, people who have at heart the interest of their community and those things that affect the welfare of the people. As a result of our consideration, after thorough and exhaustive hearings, the Subcommittee on Judiciary of the District of Columbia held executive sessions, followed by the action of the entire committee in reporting this bill to the House.

S. 1289 was passed by the other body in the last session of the Congress and sent over to the House. There are divergent views on this subject. I think most everyone is in accord that something needs to be done and must be done. Now, we will start from that premise, which is unanimous with everyone. But, the method of approach is different.

There are those who feel that it should be approached entirely differently from what we have reported here. We endeavored to resolve differences in our committe during the course of the hearings and consideration.

First, let me explain the basic differences in the Senate bill and this one reported by our committee. The Senate bill as it was sent to us proposed two new judges of the municipal court, and our committee in its wisdom thought there should be three, and therefore the House bill proposes three new judges of the municipal court.

Second, the bill as passed by the Senate provided for the appointment of commissioners to assist the judges sitting on the bench. There was great controversy over this particular question. As a result, the House bill eliminates this provision.

Then the third major difference is that the Senate bill provides for the rotation of all judges of the municipal court in the hearing of cases affected by the bill. This bill as reported by our committee would require the judges to serve in the domestic relations branch, but their services would be available in other court cases when called upon to serve in this capacity by the chief judge of the municipal court. The House bill would also provide authority for the chief judge of the municipal court to assign other judges of the court to the domestic relations branch on a temporary basis where their services are necessary.

Now, let me quote from the report as to advantages of the bill for your information:

ADVANTAGES OF THE BILL

Extensive hearings were held by a subcommittee of your committee, and a substantial number of witnesses were heard. Widely divergent views as to the merits of the legislation were voiced by witnesses. Several procedural changes in the handling of the cases affected by this bill were proposed by judges of the United States district court. Because of vigorous opposition to some of these proposals, your committee has eliminated most of them from this bill in the belief that after the domestic relations branch of the municipal court has acquired some experience in the handling of these cases, those judges may then submit to the Congress such proposals for procedural changes as their experience indicates are necessary.

By its terms, the bill would, for practical purposes, abolish the rotation of judges assigned to hear the types of cases affected by the bill and will thereby effect substantial savings in manpower on the court. By creating a specialized division in an existing court, the bill would permit economies, both financial and personnel, which would not be possible if an entirely new court were created.

The bill would relieve the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of approximately 30 percent of its numerical caseload and approximately 15 percent of the trial time devoted to the trial of civil cases. This saving will afford the United States District Court for the District of Columbia some relief in meeting an ever-mounting caseload. The Judicial Conference of the United States has approved a request for three additional judgeships to be established on the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the event the present bill, or one similar to it, is not approved by the Congress. Your committee believes that the economies realized by the creation of a domestic relations branch in the municipal court are substantial enough to justify the procedure proposed by the present bill in preference to the appointment of additional judges to the United States district court, or the creation of an entirely new court.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that there are honest differences of viewpoint but I am thoroughly convinced that it behooves us who have the responsibility of these matters for the District of Columbia to do what we think is best to resolve this question. There are all kinds of ramifications involved. I know it would be difficult to satisfy everyone. There are the practicing attorneys who devote their time to divorce proceedings, adoption cases, custody cases, and other matters concerning domestic relations problems. They are vitally interested, of course.

There are various organizations in the District who are interested. I might say here, to strengthen our position which we feel is the best approach, we have practically all of these organizations in the District of Columbia, including the Judicial Council of Federal Judges, the judges of the district court, the judges of the municipal court, various civic and religious organizations, supporting this as the best approach to this problem under the circumstances.

It will be contended that the District bar is not in accord with this viewpoint. There are differences of opinion as to whether it is a fact. Some, I am sure, will say that a committee of the District bar recommend against it. I think that is true. But that committee was composed of a relatively small percentage of the 3,000 members of the District bar. I have just received a wire from the president of the District Bar Association which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, *D. C., January 26, 1956.*
Hon. OREN HARRIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The morning press carried a story indicating the introduction of a bill by the Honorable DEWITT HYDE to retain jurisdiction of domestic relations matters in the United States District Court arising out of consideration of S. 1289. The report indicates the subject matter has the approval by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. The Bar Association of the District of Columbia has not endorsed the Hyde bill.

CHARLES RHYNE,
President, Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

Therefore, to accomplish the objectives that I explained, we believe that in the interest of this important problem for the Nation's Capital, the House should approve the bill as we have presented it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his very splendid statement in explanation of the measure before us. I have known of the problem with which this proposed legislation seeks to deal, for a number of years. I know that there is a real

problem which has been given a great deal of consideration. It has had that consideration for years and years.

I believe this specific matter has been pending before the Congress for some 5 years. I think the committee has done a good job in bringing out the bill it has. I rise only to express the hope that the legislation may go to passage and this very troublesome matter be disposed of in this fashion. It is quite obvious to me from what the gentleman has said about the approval of the judges of the District of Columbia and all of the people he mentioned who have given this matter a great deal of thought and time that the legislation must be in line with their views. It strikes me, as I say, that now is the time to dispose of it once and for all.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to my distinguished colleague the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and also my friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that this is a very good bill and it should pass.

I have here a telegram from one of the outstanding lawyers of the country, who is known and beloved by all not only for his great ability but for his sweetness of character, William E. Leahy, who is very strong in support of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. And a very able practicing attorney in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

We had a situation in Massachusetts some years ago where the superior court, which is the great trial court of our Commonwealth, was the only court that had jurisdiction over divorces. The result was that tort cases, contract cases, and other cases over which the judges of the supreme court had primary jurisdiction were more or less held back. Their having jurisdiction of divorce cases was a contributing factor to long delays in the trial of those other important cases.

The Massachusetts Legislature gave to the probate courts of our Commonwealth concurrent jurisdiction in divorce cases. That made a marked contribution toward speedy trials and hastening the trials of other cases before the superior court.

My understanding is that the United States District Court of the District is the only Federal court which has jurisdiction with reference to divorce cases.

Mr. HARRIS. It is the only Federal court in the United States that has jurisdiction over divorce and domestic proceedings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Here is the United States district court with all of its other business of great import, the important cases that come before it. It seems to me it is only logical that legislation of this kind should be enacted into law. I strongly urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman very much for his very fine statement.

Let me clarify this one thing again. The Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia has recommended the principle involved here. What they actually did was to recommend a separate court altogether, to establish a new court called a family court. There were not many who supported that viewpoint. They did support the principle behind it, yes, to do something about it. So we actually had the problem of determining whether or not to try to arrange some way within the district court itself to handle the 3,000 cases pending in the backlog today or to transfer it to the municipal court.

We felt that because of the constitutional problems involved on the question of rotation within the Federal courts here in the District of Columbia this would be the most appropriate way to handle a very complicated and highly important problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. A very important factor, a matter for consideration by a judge when a divorce case is before him, is to try to stop the divorce by trying to reconcile the parties. When a judge is under tremendous pressure to try other important cases, the difficulty in his getting time to go into the family matters and reconcile the differences is very evident. It seems to me this bill would have a very beneficial effect in the fact that the judges on a municipal bench would have more opportunity to try to bring about reconciliations than might exist in the case of the district court judges, and that is no reflection at all on our district court judges.

Mr. HARRIS. Exactly. That is precisely true.

I may say that the Attorney General of the United States has recommended this in a letter to the distinguished Speaker, which I am including in my remarks.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This proposes to establish within the municipal court a court of domestic relations; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, for this particular purpose.

Permit me to explain a little more fully and I think it would be helpful. I want this to be clearly understood, but I do not wish to consume all the time or impose myself on the House. But let me repeat.

The purposes of the bill are, first, to provide improved procedures for the handling of domestic relations cases, and second, to transfer the trials of such cases from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the only Federal court in the Nation which decides domestic relations cases, to the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

As originally brought to the attention of Congress, a bill was proposed providing a separate family court to hear domestic relations cases. It was urged that divorce and other domestic relations problems are now being heard by United States judges who customarily deal with litigation of entirely different nature. In the States, domestic relations cases are heard and decided by State trial courts. In some of the States, judges have been provided who are especially interested in and who have made extensive studies of this type of litigation. When dealing with sensitive problems of family relations, particularly when children are involved, it has been found important to endeavor to eliminate, to the extent possible, the adversary nature of the proceedings, retaining, however, full opportunity for trials of issues in respect of which agreements are not reached. In some States, the courts have been able to work out agreements as to custody and alimony in a large percentage of cases; and in some have effected reconciliations of husbands and wives. Effectiveness of such approaches to family disputes has been demonstrated by systems now existing in Michigan, California, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

The proposed program in the District of Columbia was brought to the attention of the Congress with strong support. The Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia unanimously supported the change. This conference is made up of 15 United States district court judges, who presently try domestic relations cases, and 9 judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, who consider such cases on appeal. The Judicial Conference of the United States, consisting of the Chief Justice of the United States and the chief judge of each of the United States Circuit Courts of Appeals, also unanimously endorsed the substance of the bill on 4 occasions, 3 of them at meetings presided over by Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, and 1 at a meeting presided over by the present Chief Justice, Earl Warren, in September 1954.

The bill also has support of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who are concerned with the problem. The Commissioners' Advisory Council, the juvenile court, the Board of Public Welfare, the Board of Education, United Community Services, the Washington Board of Trade, representative groups from Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish churches, and the Women's Bar Association all support the substance of the bill. The principal opposition was presented to Congress by representatives of the District of Columbia Bar Association which at a meeting rejected the proposal by a vote of 209 against 157, out of a membership of approximately 3,000. However, it was represented to the committee during hearings that 12 out of 13 past presidents of the District of Columbia Bar Association who had definitely expressed themselves had supported the proposal and that other leading lawyers in the city, including a former president of the American Bar Association, have given full support to the proposal.

Extensive hearings were held both before the House and the Senate committees. During these hearings, the question arose as to whether a separate court should be provided to handle domestic relations cases or whether the jurisdiction should be transferred to the municipal court for the District of Columbia. The judges of the municipal court took

the position that if jurisdiction over domestic relations was to be taken from the United States district court, it should be transferred to the municipal court rather than to a separate court to be created. When this point was made at the hearings, the chief judge of the United States district court was asked whether there would be objection if provision were made that three judges be appointed as a branch of the municipal court for the specific handling of domestic relations cases, assuming there were included the objectives mentioned by the separate court bill. The chief judge replied that the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia and of the United States had not specifically acted on this proposal and for that reason he was not able to state their views. However, both he and the chairman of a committee of six judges of the United States district court who had developed the proposed program agreed that if the full objectives of the separate court bill would be accomplished by a transfer to the municipal court, they could see no objection to the transfer to the municipal court.

Within the past year Congress has increased the salaries of municipal court judges from $13,000 to $17,500. Your committee feels assured that competent and well-trained judges may be induced to accept appointment in a domestic relations branch of the municipal court. And there are a number of advantages which will be accomplished by such transfer. There is presently sufficient housing available in the municipal court buildings, there is already in existence an organized clerical force, the domestic relations judges would be available for other work if their work should be current, and judges of the municipal court might be assigned from other divisions if the work of the domestic relations branch were not current. The creation of a specialized division in the municipal court will permit economies, both financial and personnel, not possible if a separate new court were created.

The bill would relieve the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of approximately 30 percent of its numerical caseload and approximately 15 percent of time devoted to trials of civil cases. This saving will afford the United States District Court for the District of Columbia relief in meeting an ever mounting caseload. The Judicial Conference of the United States has approved that a request be made to Congress for three additional judgeships to be established for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the event the present bill, or one similar to it, is not approved by the Congress. This request will not be necessary to be made if the proposed bill transferring domestic relations cases is passed. For the reasons stated, your committee, as well as the committee of the United States Senate and the Senate itself, has made provision for the transfer of the business from the United States District Court to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia.

On May 31, 1955, the Senate passed S. 1289. Lately, on December 21, 1955, the Attorney General of the United States, by letters written to Speaker RAYBURN and Minority Leader MARTIN, expressed his approval of the passage of the House bill, stating it is his belief that in conference with representatives of the Senate, an effective manner of working out the transfer of jurisdiction of domestic relations cases and the objectives of improving the procedures in such cases may be accomplished.

Thus all parties intimately concerned in the problems of domestic relations cases, the judiciary of the United States, the judges of the municipal court, the Attorney General, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and every leading organization in the city interested in the family problems has approved the general substance of the proposed transfer, with the exception of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia by a sharply divided vote of approximately one-sixth of its membership.

In addition to the transfer of domestic relations business from the United States district court to the municipal court, there is a provision for the transfer of adoption proceedings which presently are held in the United States district court. No opposition to this transfer has been mentioned.

The bill authorizes appointment of three additional judges to the municipal court. A study was made by a representative of the administrative office of the United States courts in an effort to ascertain the time spent each year by judges of the United States district court in dealing with domestic relations cases. Following this study it was concluded that the domestic relations cases and adoption cases will require the time of three judges.

As has hitherto been stated, the bill as approved by the House committee provides that the judges appointed to the domestic relations branch of the municipal court shall, during their tenure of office, serve in such branch, but the chief judge of the court, if he finds the work will not be adversely affected, may assign any of the judges in the domestic relations branch to perform the duties of any other judge. He also is given authority to assign any other judge of the court to serve temporarily in the domestic relations branch if in the opinion of the chief judge the work of the domestic relations branch occasions such assignment. One of the problems arising in handling domestic relations cases by the United States district court has been that in many instances a wife or a husband, who has lost a decision as to custody or alimony after final hearing, has been able, due to the rotation of judges from one to another branch of business in the court, to have their cases heard anew before other judges. Decisions as to custody and alimony do not have the status of being final, as is true in the usual type of litigation. It often occurs that losing parties in domestic relations cases, after losing decisions following lengthy hearings, will again apply to the court in an effort to obtain a different decision, the claim being made that conditions have changed since the previous ruling of the court. This usually happens after the judge who heard the case has moved to another division of the court. Immediately upon a judge being assigned to a new division, the chief judge sets up a calendar of important cases in the new division for him to try. In these important cases, the judge must pass upon all motions, conduct the pretrial, and take all steps necessary to dispose of preliminary matters, as well as conduct the final trial.

These important cases have special trial dates set, many have out-of-town witnesses, and prominent counsel have reserved the times to try them. It is not feasible to transfer back one of these judges to hear a domestic relations case which he previously decided, in which a change of facts may be said to have occurred since the case was decided. Thus the hearing before a different judge may be accomplished. The attention of the committee at its hearings was called to instances in which hearings in divorce cases involving custody, maintenance, or alimony have actually been held before as many as 8 or 10 different judges. Some of these hearings were on precisely the same questions previously decided by other judges. The great expense of these repeated trials, the continued harassment of the families concerned, and the tremendous waste of time of the court, witnesses, and parties obviously is damaging to the cause of justice.

While it has been suggested that either the judges themselves or Congress by legislation might provide a domestic relations branch in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, with provision against rotation of judges similar to the provision made in respect of the municipal court in the present bill, there is serious question as to the legality of such a provision in respect of the United States district court. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the United States District Court for the District of Columbia is one organized by Congress pursuant to provisions of the Constitution. The judges of this court have the same full powers and jurisdiction of judges of other United States courts. Judges and lawyers therefore have questioned the legality of a provision limiting United States district judges to hearing only divorce cases. No similar problem exists in respect of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. It is strictly a legislative court, not formed pursuant to the Constitution and Congress has full power to provide for the assignment of its judges to specified business.

The second major objective of the bill is to relieve the United States district court, the only Federal court in the Nation which hears divorce cases, from trials of these cases. Not only is it unusual that this type of business be heard by a United States court, but, as pointed out by the Attorney General in advocating passage of the House bill, there is now an intense and continuing interest in reducing delays in disposing of cases before United States courts throughout the Nation. He points out that while the criminal calendar of the United States district court for the District of Columbia is current and has been maintained in that state for some years, there is presently a delay of about 2 years in the dis-

position of civil cases. Your committee has been informed that the judges of the United States district court for the District of Columbia presently have the largest individual caseload and the most diversified business of any judges in the United States courts. Much Government litigation of the greatest importance is disposed of by this United States district court situated in the Capital of the Nation. The Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended that if the domestic relations work is to continue to be carried on in the United States district court, three additional judges will be required to keep current its present business and to have any prospect of reducing delays in reaching civil cases for trial. Three new judges in the municipal court may be appointed at less expense to the Government. Your committee is convinced they will be able to competently handle this volume of business and the relief to the United States district court brought about by the transfer of domestic relations and adoption cases will enable it to get its civil trial calendar current.

It has been estimated the cost of the operation of the domestic relations branch of the municipal court will approximate $112,050 a year. This figure is lower than the comparable cost either of appointing additional judges to the United States district court or of creating an entirely new court for the carrying on of this judicial business.

Seldom has any proposal been brought to the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia with the overwhelming support given the objectives sought to be accomplished in the handling of domestic relations cases in the District of Columbia. The proposal was brought to the attention of Congress as long as 5 years ago. Your committee believes it to be of importance that the Senate bill as amended should pass without further delay.

DECEMBER 21, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I have the honor to address you in reference to legislation now pending before the Congress which proposes to transfer jurisdiction over domestic relations matters in the District of Columbia from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

S. 1289, "An act to establish a Domestic Relations Branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," passed the Senate on May 31, 1955, and was referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia. That committee reported the bill, with amendments, on July 1, 1955, and the legislation is awaiting action on the floor of the House. (Rept. No. 1302; Union Calendar No. 411.)

The program of removing domestic relations cases from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has had the approval of the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit, also the Judicial Conference of the United States. As presented to these judicial conferences, a separate court was advocated, but in the course of the hearings in Congress the chief judge of the United States district court and the judge who is chairman of a committee of judges of the United States district court, appointed to work on the proposed legislation indicated there is no objection to a transfer to the municipal court so long as provisions for making improvement over the present system of handling domestic relations cases is maintained in the legislation. The chief judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia approves the transfer on this basis. In my judgment the bill as reported by the House Committee of the District of Columbia should be adopted by the House of Representatives. In the event of its passage, I am sure that in conference between the committees of the House and Senate, an agreement may be reached to incorporate adequate provisions to accomplish the desired improvements.

The Department of Justice and the other executive departments of the Government have an intense and continuing interest in reducing the delays attendant upon the disposition of cases before the Federal judiciary throughout the Nation. While the criminal calendar of the United States district court for the District of Columbia is current and has been maintained current for several years, there is presently a delay of about 2 years in the disposition of civil cases in that court. It is the position of the administration that if the above or comparable legislation were enacted into law, the delay in the trial of cases in the district court will be substantially lessened. There also will be accomplished a decided improvement in the handling of domestic relations cases.

The jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia is peculiar in that Washington is a "Federal" city. By reason of its history, the court has jurisdiction over many local matters handled by State, county, and city courts in other jurisdictions. It is the only Federal bench in the country handling domestic relations matters, and its judges spend an estimated 15 to 18 percent of their time on such litigation.

S. 1289 as reported by the House Committee on the District of Columbia provides for the creation of a separate branch of the municipal court, and the appointment and assignment of three additional judges thereto, with exclusive jurisdiction over domestic relations litigation arising in the District of Columbia. I believe that the separate domestic relations branch of the court contemplated by this legislation would be able to promptly and efficiently dispose of all matters requiring immediate attention in connection with this type of litigation, such as maintenance, support, custody, and so forth.

The work of the municipal court for the District of Columbia has remained current for the past 2 years, and that court has demonstrated its capacity to assume additional jurisdiction over local matters. Originally the municipal court had very limited jurisdiction. The act of April 1, 1942, consolidated the former police court and the former municipal court, and the new court was given greater civil jurisdiction. It was the intent and purpose of the proponents of that legislation that the new municipal court would in the course of time assume many judicial burdens of a purely local nature which were imposed upon the District Court for the District of Columbia, and thereby relieve the latter tribunal and enable it to devote more time to its fundamental purposes. The passage of legislation transferring jurisdiction in domestic relations matters to the municipal court would be a progressive step in that direction and I urge that it be given as prompt attention as possible.

With my warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
Attorney General.

(Copy to Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.)

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Arkansas, the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the District of Columbia Committee, which dealt with this subject matter and this legislation has made a very fine statement with reference to the purpose of the legislation. I concur in what he said generally. Hearings of great length were held on this legislation last year.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to get one point in the RECORD, which I believe would be appropriate at this time, following what has already been said. There may be in the minds of some of our colleagues the question of cost or additional expense or the matter of creating additional jobs. Is it not true that notwithstanding how this matter might be resolved, it is contemplated there will have to be some new judges to take over this problem? In other words, if it remains in the district court, they propose to ask for three additional judges.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. And if it goes to the family court they would have to have three judges for that court.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. And if it is transferred to the municipal court, of course, the judges would have to be appointed to take care of the responsibilities in that court. So there are no new jobs or extra expense involved, if one procedure is followed as against another.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman is correct. Following that particular point, I might point out that the municipal court has available the courtrooms for these three judges. I am not sure that would be true if it remains in the Federal district court. Of course, there is a difference of $5,000 a year in the salaries of the judges of the United States district court and the judges of the municipal court so that there would be a saving of $15,000 a year in the salary item alone. If a separate court were to be established, of course, there arises the question of new quarters. It means a complete new setup whereas in the municipal court, the facilities and personnel are already available. Of course, there might be some additions of personnel that might have to be made, but there are the facilities and a skeleton-trained personnel already available. Therefore, the expense would be far less if it were transferred to the municipal court.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota tell us how many municipal court judges we now have?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. We have 12 municipal court judges.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us what the cost of maintaining the municipal court of the District of Columbia is?

Mr. O'HARA. Those figures do not come immediately to my mind, but the income of the court is far greater than the costs of the court.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. HYDE. In order to make it clear for the record, is it not true that the court is self-sustaining?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Yes, the municipal court is self-sustaining?

Mr. Chairman, the matter of domestic relations and divorces is one of the important and delicate matters we have to deal with in our respective States. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has indicated, there is a dual jurisdiction in his State. But involved in divorce matters, is the juvenile problem. In the District of Columbia, the juvenile court is in the municipal court and the judge of the juvenile court is substituted for by judges of the municipal court. So that this backlog of delay of the trial of these divorce cases and domestic relation problems, problems concerning the support of children, juvenile problems, are problems which should be met and dealt with with the greatest of expedition.

I do believe that one of the most important things in connection with this matter has been the excellent job that the municipal court has done in the last 2 years in becoming current in its business before that court.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. CRETELLA. You have made reference to a 3,000-case backlog. What does the bill propose to do with those cases? Transfer them automatically, or is there a setoff date?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Let me reply to the gentleman. We ran into quite a tangled problem when this matter was under consideration of the transfer of existing cases from the United States district court to the municipal court. Some of the members of the bar presented to us very powerful arguments against that transfer and its possible effect. I think the judges and the bar are agreed that in this situation it would be better to leave those cases that are now pending in the United States district court where they are, and for the domestic relations branch of the municipal court to start out clean and take up those cases as they are filed. The reason for not transferring was the legal difficulties that became involved in such an attempt to transfer. I think there is unanimity among the members of the bar, some of the very excellent lawyers who appeared before us, and the judges, that that will have to be the problem of the district court, to dispose as quickly as they can, the cases filed in the District of Columbia Federal court.

Mr. CRETELLA. Then both the Federal court and this new proposed transfer would have concurrent jurisdiction until the backlog is cleaned up?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. In effect it would amount to that, although when this bill becomes law, if it does, all new cases will be filed in the municipal court, and for a period of time until the cases are cleared up in the district court, there would be, in effect, the two jurisdictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has again expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. This is a highly controversial bill, in spite of the apparent agreement that has been shown among the previous speakers. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-two Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 2]

Albert	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Avery	Holifield	Rees, Kans.
Barrett	Holtzman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hope	Richards
	Ikard	Riley
Bow	Jarman	Rivers
Bowler	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Bray	Judd	Sadlak
Brownson	Kearney	Scott
Chase	King, Pa.	Seely-Brown
Chatham	Kluczynski	Sheehan
Chudoff	Knox	Shelley
Church	Knutson	Sheppard
Clark	Lesinski	Smith, Kans.
Cooley	McDowell	Steed
Dague	Macdonald	Taylor
Diggs	Mack, Wash.	Teague, Tex.
Dodd	Martin	Thompson, La.
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, N. Y.	Thompson, Mich.
Durham	Mollohan	
Eberharter	Morgan	Thornberry
Edmondson	Morrison	Tuck
Fino	Moulder	Tumulty
Flynt	O'Brien, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Fulton	Patterson	Velde
Gamble	Pfost	Vorys
Garmatz	Poage	Walters
Gordon	Polk	Willis
Granahan	Prouty	Wolcott
Gregory	Rabaut	Zablocki
Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 1289, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 333 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the point of no quorum was made, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] had been recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the local bar of the District of Columbia who has practiced before all of the courts of the District of Columbia, I think I reflect the point of view of most of the members of that bar in opposition to this bill which would transfer the jurisdiction over domestic relations cases from the United States district court to the municipal court.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman will concede, will he not, that the District bar has not taken a vote on this bill?

Mr. HYDE. I will concede that. If the gentleman from Minnesota will recall, I said I think I reflect the point of view of the majority of the bar, and at this point I might say that the committee of the bar on domestic relations has acted on this subject and has voted against this bill, and further has suggested an alternative in the form of a bill which would leave the jurisdiction of the domestic relations matters in the district court as a separate branch of that court. I have introduced that bill today, and at the appropriate time I expect to move to recommit the bill before us so that we may consider the alternative offered in that bill. Now, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman from Maryland was on the subcommittee that heard this legislation which was presented to us. You recall the bar association had opposed the setting up of a separate family court.

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The bar association opposed the setting up of a separate family court by a substantial vote, but it had never during all of the hearings taken any vote during the time that this bill was under consideration. Is my memory not correct on that?

Mr. HYDE. That is right. As a matter of fact, I do not remember this particular measure which we have before us today ever being submitted to the bar association nor did any member of the bar testify one way or the other. My recollection is that the only person who testified on the matter of transferring this to the municipal court was the chief judge of that court who, if you will recall, said that he was not urging it but would be perfectly willing to accept the jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, there are some very important reasons from the standpoint of lawyers who are members of the local bar, why they do not want the jurisdiction over an important matter such as domestic relations handled in the municipal court. I want to make it clear that in my opposition to this bill, I mean no reflection whatsoever upon the municipal court nor, of course, upon the membership of that court. Chief Judge Leonard Walsh, of the municipal court, has done a magnificent job in recent years. He has brought that court from the point where it was over a year and one-half behind in its calendar to the point where today you can get a trial in the court within 30 days. The court is doing a good job, but it is a court of limited jurisdiction. I believe that the majority of the practicing members of the local bar do not think it should be given the jurisdiction to handle domestic relations matters.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it true that all of the judges in the District of Columbia, or all of the courts in the District approved the measure presently before us?

Mr. HYDE. I do not know that that is true—no.

Mr. HALLECK. That is my information. Also, that it is supported by the Attorney General and by the administration and by many of the organizations in the District of Columbia who have a particular interest in matters of this sort.

Mr. HYDE. If I may answer the gentleman from Indiana, we have never received any testimony before our committee to the effect that the persons and the organizations to which the gentleman from Indiana refers have approved this particular bill. They approved another bill setting up a family court, but I do not know that all of these judges and all of these organizations have approved this particular proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. To answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, I can assure the gentleman that all of the judges of the United States district court and all of the judges of the municipal court, and I am not sure about the circuit court of appeals, but altogether, 48 judges approved this bill and it is also a fact that the Attorney General of the United States approves this bill.

Mr. HYDE. I have no doubt whatsoever that the judges of the district court have approved this bill, because they would be glad to get rid of this burdensome duty. I have no doubt whatsoever that the judges of the municipal court approve it because they would be delighted to have this additional jurisdiction.

These are the reasons why members of the local bar do not think that this municipal court should have jurisdiction of domestic relations cases: In the first place, no State in the Union has placed the jurisdiction of domestic relations matters in an inferior court, which is what this court is. It is a court of limited jurisdiction. It has no jurisdiction over felony cases. Its civil jurisdiction is limited to $3,000. It cannot treat title to real property and things of that sort. No other State in the United States has put domestic relations cases in a court of that limited jurisdiction.

In the second place, the subpena power of the municipal court is more limited than that of the United States District Court. It is limited to the confines of the District of Columbia, whereas the United States district court can subpena people within a 100-mile radius of the District of Columbia, which, with the expanding area of metropolitan Washington, is very important when getting the necessary witnesses to testify in these very important cases.

In the third place, a judgment in the United States district court can be registered in any other Federal Court in the United States, so that if you get a judgment in a domestic relations case in the United States District Court of the District of Columbia, all you have to do to enforce that judgment in some other State is to take it into the Federal court in that jurisdiction and register it. You do not have to have a new trial. However, if you put these cases in the municipal court you would have to take a judgment of the municipal court into the State court where you wanted to go, and have a trial on that judgment before you could get any action.

In the fourth place, in view of the limited jurisdiction of the municipal court you would not be able to settle all of your difficulties in one suit, as you can in the United States district court. For instance, if there is any issue as to the title to property between the parties, you would have to file a separate suit in the United States court if you filed a divorce case in the municipal court: It would lead to a multiplicity of suits, which we have tried to get away from in recent changes in rules of procedure.

In the fifth place, it would be an additional expense for the litigants, because in the United States district court you have court reporters taking all the testimony, and if you want to pay for a transcript you may do so. In the municipal court there are no regular court reporters in attendance, and if you want to have a reporter there the litigant would have to pay for it. So that there would be an additional expense to the litigant in these domestic relations matters in the municipal court.

I would like to call attention to the fact that the alternative to the pending bill which I have introduced in the form of a bill today and which has been recommended by a majority of the committee on domestic relations of the District of Columbia bar, provides for setting up a domestic relations branch of the United States district court. We do not want to be just negative about it, but we have offered what we think is a better approach to the problem, and at the proper time I will make a motion to recommit, so that we may consider this alternative.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman mentioned that his proposal had just been introduced. Is it not a matter of fact that this entire problem has been before the District Committee for 5 years?

Mr. HYDE. I do not know; I have not been here that long.

Mr. HARRIS. But the gentleman has been a member of the committee involved in this matter.

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. For how long?

Mr. HYDE. I served on the Bar Association committee on this subject about 5 years ago.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right. So it has been constantly before the District Committee for that period of time.

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. But the gentleman is just proposing his bill today.

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman said it was recommended by the committee on domestic relations of the bar. Has it been presented to the bar?

Mr. HYDE. It will be presented at the next meeting which will be Tuesday of next week.

Mr. HARRIS. But it has not been yet?

Mr. HYDE. Not this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. How many members are there on the domestic relations committee?

Mr. HYDE. I believe about 20.

Mr. HARRIS. And there are approximately 3,000 members of the bar of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, on the rolls.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Including lobbyists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, with all deference to those who espouse this measure, the House ought to follow the suggestion made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE]. He is the only member of the District bar who has thus far spoken. He has particularly interested himself in this pending problem. Unquestionably he is closer to the problem than any man in the House.

I know that every Member of the House respects the gentleman from Maryland. He has asked the Members of the House to send this bill back to the committee and let the members do the job right.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. My time is limited, but if the gentleman insists I will yield to him. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman. I want to agree with the gentleman and concur in the high regard we all have for the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. ABERNETHY. I appreciate that. What is the question?

Mr. HALLECK. But is it not true that what he proposes to do is to offer a straight motion to recommit, which simply means this measure is defeated today?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Oh, no, no.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me go on. The gentleman knows the situation is a tough one.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further. I have only 10 minutes.

No; it is not his purpose to kill the bill; it is not the purpose of anyone to kill this bill.

This legislation has not been bandied around for 5 years as was suggested a moment ago. The first bill came to the 2d session of the 83d Congress, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON]. That bill, not this but the other bill, is the one which was endorsed by the District judges. It never got out of the subcommittee of which Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota was then chairman. In fact, he opposed that bill and he probably was right.

The District Bar Association did not endorse either that or the pending bill. It insisted on keeping these important issues in a competent court, the District court. Actually that was the feeling of the committee at that time as disclosed by its failure to act. Now, late in May of last year somebody conceived the idea

of turning this over to a court, whose judges had—I hate to say this but we all know it is true—lobbied themselves into some pretty remunerative salaries. In the hearings you will find that only one man testified in favor of this bill and he is one of those judges.

The District Bar Association wants this bill to go back to committee. I want to read from the testimony of a representative of the District bar.

He went on to say that the District judges did not want this jurisdiction. I think some members of the committee agree that the District judges do not want this work. Now, listen to this—but before I read the testimony let me say that this type of lawsuit is closer to the American home than any other lawsuit that comes in the courthouse. It involves the principles upon which our Nation was founded and perpetuated, and that is the sanctity of the home and the perpetuation of the home, the care of children and the preservation of the family. What are we about to do with the domestic problems if we pass this bill? We are proceeding to confer jurisdiction of these important lawsuits upon the lowest court—and I say it with all deference to the court—in the District of Columbia. And if we do, it will be the only municipal court in the entire United States which has such jurisdiction. What did the representative of the District bar say? He said:

> Most of the business of the municipal court is traffic cases.

Now, listen:

> Drunks, prostitutes, sex perverts, small-claims cases, collecting for the Seventh Street credit houses and that sort of thing.

Now, with all deference the District bar has asked the Congress through its Representative, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] to send this bill back to the committee. It will then come forward and support legislation which would establish a domestic relations branch in a highly respected court of the District of Columbia—that is, the Federal district court. That is all they are asking you to do and I very deeply feel this House ought to cooperate.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake to take these cases which involve the very foundation of our family life, the home and the domestic life of our country, and frequently, according to the testimony presented, sums of money and properties of forty, fifty or a hundred thousand dollars in value, and rest their jurisdiction in the lowest court of the District. It would be a serious mistake to confer this jurisdiction upon a police court that has to do with what? With traffic cases, with drunks, with prostitutes, with the collection of small claims, and so forth. That was not my testimony. It was the testimoy of a member of the District bar and it stands undisputed in the record. I am simply repeating to you the appeal that was made to the District committee by the District of Columbia Bar Association.

It has been stated here that there are 3,000 members of the District bar and a majority of them did not vote on this thing. That is true but it must be remembered that most of the members of the District bar do not practice law. They have signs over their doors which read "lawyer" but they practice politics, they practice lobbying, and a few other things. There are about 400 or 500 members of the District bar who are particularly engaged in domestc practice and they have turned this bill down. They ask you to establish a branch in a court which is a court of respectable jurisdiction, one with sufficient jurisdiction to qualify it for the trial of such important cases as those presented by domestic differences.

I am not falling out with anyone. I have no bitterness about this thing. I do have some very deep convictions about it. I say again, you are making a serious mistake if you pass this bill.

The facts are that when the original family-court bill first came to the Congress in 1954 it passed the Senate in the form recommended by the Commissioners, by the churches of the District of Columbia, by the Judicial Conference, the Citizens Advisory Council, by the Washington Board of Trade, Rev. Leo J. Coady, the United Community Service, the Washington Federation of Churches, the Jewish Social Service Agency and many others. They endorsed that bill and it was passed by the Senate. It got over here and was bogged down. I am not criticizing anyone for that. Then late last year some judges who run the municipal court decided, after they had their pay up to $6,000 more than the District Commissioners, that maybe they ought to dignify the court with some real jurisdiction.

So they started telephoning. Everybody knows that is the fact. They came up on the Hill and lobbied all day long just as they did on their salary bill.

If I have offended anyone, I am sorry. I love the Members of this House and I think a lot of the District of Columbia. I have served on this committee since I came here 14 years ago. In every instance, I have tried to do what I thought was best for it. Probably this bill will pass. I know it is often the practice when a bill comes here to rush it through. I beg you to go slow and follow the suggestion of our colleague, Mr. HYDE, who is a member of the District bar, a respected and able member of the bar, who promises that this committee will have an opportunity for the first time to consider something that everybody can agree upon and accomplish that which everyone desires.

I urge you, therefore, to send this bill back to the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, my only interest in this bill is to see that the domestic relations cases here in the District of Columbia are brought up to date and to see that cases of this nature are properly handled and do not take up too much time of our Federal judges. The chief judge of the United States district court has been to see me on numerous occasions, and the other judges of the Federal court here have been to see me and have talked to me in an effort to have this problem solved. I have no interest in the courts here other than from a legislative point of view to see that they may properly function. I understand that the domestic relations cases are tying up at least one-third of the time of the Federal judges here in the District, and on occasion these cases are 6 years behind. Now, the chief judge of the municipal court has been before our committee, and he tells me that they are up with their agenda of cases and that they are well capable of handling these domestic relations cases. The Federal court in my State does not handle any divorce cases. All of these cases are handled by the State courts which is comparable to the municipal court here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill can be acted on favorably, as it has been before our committee all of last year and we have held, it seems to me, sufficient hearings to satisfy everyone that this is a deserving and a very necessary piece of legislation. I hope the committee will vote down the proposal made by my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HYDE, as there have been no hearings on that bill, and we should dispose of this legislation without further delay.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that there may be some Members of the House who have respect for the work of committees and the time that is taken up in the reporting of bills to the House, but over the last year or so it seems to be impossible for any bill to come out of the Committee on the District of Columbia without serious opposition from certain members of the committee, which, of course, is their high privilege.

Now, here we have a situation in which the gentleman from Arkansas, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary, and the members on the subcommittee spent long weeks and days of hearings and consideration of a problem that is a very serious one in the District of Columbia. Something has to be done. Some may say that a municipal court is no place to try domestic relations cases. Well, you have various courts; you have various types of courts where the type of judge is no different than the type of judge that is serving in the municipal court here. There is no court in the country that has a finer record of being current than the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and I would make this statement, if my friend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] wants to deny it, that there are as fine lawyers serving as judges in that court as any court in the District of Columbia or the State of Maryland. There may be some, as there are in all courts, that some of the lawyers do not regard very highly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Our distinguished friend from Mississippi made a rather amusing statement a while ago as to the type of cases that were considered and handled in the municipal court of the District of Columbia, which, of course, would have some reflection, as I under-

stood him; at least, that is the way I considered the statement, as he quoted a gentleman, a member of the bar, and a very esteemed member. It is a well known fact that he is a practicing attorney in domestic relations matters. Is that not true?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. In view of that, and with reference to the matter of jurisdiction, I should like to impose on the time of my good friend from Minnesota, if he will permit, to read what the jurisdiction of this court is as provided by the Congress:

The municipal court of the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction in the following civil cases in which the claimed value of personal property or the debt or damages claimed, exclusive of interest and costs, does not exceed $3,000, namely, in all civil cases in which the amount claimed to be due for debt or damages arises out of contracts, express or implied, or damages for wrongs or injuries to persons or property, including all proceedings by attachment or in replevin (except in cases involving title to real estate or actions against judges of the municipal court or other officers for official misconduct), and in actions for the recovery of damages for assault, assault and battery, slander, libel, malicious prosecution, and breach of promise to marry.

That is the jurisdiction of this court upon which the reflection was made a few minutes ago.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is my understanding that that court has jurisdiction up to $3,000.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right, $3,000.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. And in addition to that, the court has general equity jurisdiction and I do not know of any other municipal court in the United States that has that. This is not a J. P. court or a squire's court, or anything of that kind. The court is filled by appointment for 10 years, of capable lawyers, appointed by the President of the United States, whoever he may be.

Mr. HARRIS. And confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. And confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman spoke of the work of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I, for one, want the gentleman to understand and all members of that committee to understand that as far as I am concerned I appreciate the work that they do. Many times it is a thankless job.

I want to say again, as I indicated before, that I think the committee has given this matter very careful study and has come here with a proposal that has widespread endorsement and which I think is sound and good. It seeks to deal with the problem that everyone admits exists. So I trust we will be able to dispose of it today and not have it sent back to the committee where it would languish again for no one knows how long.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman states the situation exactly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to say that I think the RECORD should show here that what I said about the court I read from the testimony of a member of the District bar. The words that my colleague refer to were not mine. They were those of a practicing attorney of the District. Since the gentleman said that this is not a J. P. court, may I ask the gentleman, if he had a J. P. lawsuit in the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, in what court would it be filed?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The only place it would be filed would be the municipal court. But its jurisdiction is far and away beyond that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a question which I direct to the chairman of the committee or to anyone else of the committee who may want to answer it. It seems to me the most persuasive argument against this bill advanced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] is the very strict limitation on the subpena power. I notice on page 9 of the bill, section 105, which has to do with the jurisdiction of the domestic-relations branch, it says that it will have jurisdiction in civil actions to enforce support of minor children, enforcement of nonsupport rulings against husbands who are not inclined to support their wives or their children.

If the subpena power of this court is as limited as the gentleman from Maryland says, would it not be a simple matter for me, as a husband who did not want to support my wife, or a father who did not want to support my children, to frustrate the entire judicial process by going over to Arlington or going to Silver Spring or to Bethesda? Is that a correct analysis of the situation?

Mr. HYDE. Yes; there is that possibility of course, in support cases. Nevertheless, what we are talking about here primarily is the subpena of witnesses. The service of summons is the same in both courts. It is the power to subpena witnesses.

Mr. HARRIS. To answer directly the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you use the same procedure that is used in all jurisdictions, and that is, have the proceedings filed in the jurisdiction to which the man has gone, and therefore carry out the judgment of the court.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I raised this question in the committee when the municipal court idea was proposed. I think it was pointed out there that we are taking jurisdiction away from a court which has the authority to subpena and cite for contempt across the District line, and are placing jurisdiction now in a court which does not have that authority. As the gentleman so well pointed out, it would be a very easy matter for a person who would be subject to contempt to beat the contempt by simply stepping across the line into Maryland or Virginia.

Mr. HARRIS. The fact remains that the subpena power that he mentions in the District Court is limited to about 100 miles, I think, or for a short distance across the line. If the party involved wants to use the devious means the gentleman suggests that he might use, all he has to do to get out of the jurisdiction under the existing subpena powers of the Federal Court is to go beyond the 100 miles. If he would go 20 miles to do it, certainly he would go 100 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created in the municipal court for the District of Columbia a domestic relations branch.

SEC. 2. Definitions: As used in this act—

(a) "Branch" and "domestic relations branch" mean the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia created by this act;

(b) "Court" means the municipal court for the District of Columbia and the several judges thereof.

SEC. 3. (a) Additional judges: The first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and to prescribe the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes," approved October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 887), is hereby amended by striking therefrom "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen."

(b) One or more judges of the municipal court shall serve in said branch for such periods and in such order of rotation as the judges of the court may determine.

SEC. 4. The court shall have authority to appoint a commissioner or commissioners to assist the judges sitting in the branch. In accordance with rules adopted by the court, such commissioner or commissioners may investigate facts and file for the consideration of the judges in the branch a report setting forth the information obtained by such investigation: *Provided*, That the right to examine, and file exceptions to any such report, shall be reserved to each interested party or his attorney.

SEC. 5. Jurisdiction of domestic relations branch: The domestic relations branch and each judge sitting therein shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all actions for divorce from the bond of marriage and legal separation from bed and board, including proceedings incidental to such actions for alimony, pendente lite and permanent, and for support and custody of minor children; applications for revocation of divorce from bed and board; civil actions to enforce support of minor children; civil actions to enforce support of wife; actions seeking custody of minor children; actions to declare marriages void; actions to declare marriages valid; actions for annulments of marriage; and proceedings in adoption.

SEC. 6. (a) Domestic relations branch vested with power to effectuate purposes of act: The domestic relations branch is hereby vested with so much of the power as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, whether in law or in equity, as is necessary to effectuate the

purposes of this act, including, but not limited to, the power to issue restraining orders, injunctions, writs of habeas corpus, and ne exeat, and all other writs, orders, and decrees.

(b) The domestic relations branch shall have the same power to enforce and execute judgments, orders, and decrees entered by it as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Judgments of the branch shall have the same legal status as liens upon real estate as judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. (a) Amendments of statutes: Section 963 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1345, ch. 845), as amended by the act approved June 21, 1949 (63 Stat. 215, ch. 233; sec. 16–416, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking therefrom "United States District Court for the District of Columbia," and inserting in lieu thereof "Domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 3, and section 13 of the act entitled "An act to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia," approved June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 241), is amended by striking therefrom "United States District" and inserting in lieu thereof "domestic relations branch of the Municipal."

(c) Section 6 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 194), as amended, is amended (1) by striking "Office of the Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia" and by striking "Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia," and by inserting in lieu of each such phrase "office of the clerk of the municipal court for the District of Columbia," and (2) by striking "justice of said court" and inserting in lieu thereof "judge sitting in the domestic relations branch of said court."

SEC. 8. Docket: A separate docket shall be maintained for the domestic relations branch. There shall be recorded in such docket the actions taken at each stage of each action and proceeding instituted or conducted in the branch.

SEC. 9. Process: Service of process for the domestic relations branch shall be made by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia or by any of his authorized assistants or in such other manner as the court may by rule prescribe. Service of process for the domestic relations branch may also be had by publication in the same manner as service of process is had by publication for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 10. (a) Pending cases and files transferred to domestic relations branch: All cases which, on the effective date of this section, are pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and are within the jurisdiction of the domestic relations branch, together with all files, papers, documents, and records in the custody of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia relating to such pending cases shall be transferred to the domestic relations branch.

(b) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall, on and after the effective date of this section and upon request of any judge sitting in the domestic-relations branch, transfer to such branch the files, papers, documents, and records relating to any case in which final judgment has been entered in respect to divorce from the bond of marriage; legal separation from bed and board; revocation of divorce from bed and board; enforcement of support of minor children or wife; actions for custody of minor children; voiding or validating of marriages; annulment of marriage; or adoption, whether or not any such case has been reopened prior to the effective date of this section.

(c) All judgments, orders, processes, directions, and proceedings entered in any pending or reopened case transferred to the domestic relations branch pursuant to this act shall be continued and proceeded with, and may be modified, enforced, and executed with the same force and effect as if proceeded with in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and no such action or proceeding shall abate or be in anywise affected by the enactment of this act.

SEC. 11. Rules: The court shall by rules prescribe the fees, charges, and costs and the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure in actions and proceedings in the domestic relations branch. Such rules shall neither abridge, enlarge, nor modify the substantive rights of any litigant. Except as otherwise specifically provided by such rules, the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall govern in the branch.

SEC. 12. Appeals: Any party aggrieved by any final or interlocutory order or judgment entered in the domestic relations branch shall have the same right of appeal available in respect to any final or interlocutory order or judgment entered in the civil branch of the court.

SEC. 13. Sessions: The domestic-relations branch, with at least one judge in attendance, shall be open for the transaction of business every day of the year except Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and legal holidays, and, if deemed necessary, may also hold night sessions.

SEC. 14. Jurisdiction of juvenile court not affected: Nothing contained in this act shall be construed so as to affect or diminish the jurisdiction of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, or any judge presiding therein.

SEC. 15. Appropriations authorized: Appropriations for expenses necessary for the operation of the domestic relations branch including personal services, are hereby authorized.

SEC. 16. Effective dates: This act, except sections 5, 6, 7, and 10, shall take effect upon its approval. Sections 5, 6, 7, and 10 shall take effect 30 days after the appointment and qualification of the two additional judges authorized by this act to be appointed to the court.

With the following committee amendment:

DOMESTIC RELATIONS BRANCH, MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 101. That there is hereby created in the municipal court for the District of Columbia a domestic relations branch.

SEC. 102. Definition: As used in this act—

(a) "branch" and "domestic relations branch" mean the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia created by this act;

(b) "Court" means the municipal court for the District of Columbia and the several judges thereof.

SEC. 103. (a) Additional judges: The first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and to prescribe the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes," approved October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 887), is hereby amended by striking therefrom "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen."

(b) The judges appointed to the additional positions authorized by the amendments set forth in subsection (a) of this section shall during their tenures of office serve as judges of the domestic relations branch, but the chief judge of the court may, if he finds the work in the domestic relations branch will not be adversely affected thereby assign any of said judges of the domestic relations branch to perform the duties of any other judge of the court. The chief judge of the court shall also have the authority to assign any of the other judges of the court to serve temporarily in the domestic relations branch if, in the opinion of the said chief judge, the work of the domestic relations branch requires such assignment.

SEC. 104. The judges of the domestic relations branch, with the approval of the chief judge of the court, shall have authority to appoint and remove a clerk and such other personnel as may be necessary for the operation of the branch.

SEC. 105. Jurisdiction of domestic relations branch: The domestic relations branch and each judge sitting therein shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all actions for divorce from the bond of marriage and legal separation from bed and board, including proceedings incidental to such actions for alimony, pendente lite and permanent, and for support and custody of minor children; applications for revocation of divorce from bed and board; civil actions to enforce support of minor children; civil actions to enforce support of wife; actions seeking custody of minor children; actions to declare marriages void; actions to declare marriages valid; actions for annulments of marriage; and proceedings in adoption.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to divest the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of jurisdiction and power to consider, and to enter and enforce judgments, orders, and decrees in any such action, application or proceeding filed in such court prior to the effective date of this section to the same extent as if this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 106. (a) Domestic relations branch vested with power to effectuate purposes of act: The domestic relations branch is hereby vested with so much of the power as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, whether in law or in equity, as is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, including but not limited to, the power to issue restraining orders, injunctions, writs of habeas corpus, and ne exeat, and all other writs, orders, and decrees.

(b) The domestic relations branch shall have the same power to enforce and execute judgment, orders, and decrees entered by it as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Judgments of the branch shall have the same legal status as liens upon real estate as judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 107. (a) Amendments of statutes: Section 963 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1345, ch. 845), as amended by the act approved June 21, 1949 (63 Stat. 215, ch. 233; sec. 16–416, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.) is amended by striking therefrom "United States District Court for the District of Columbia," and inserting in lieu thereof "domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 3, and section 13 of the act entitled "An act to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia," approved June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 241), is amended by striking therefrom "United States District" and inserting in lieu thereof "domestic relations branch of the municipal."

(c) Section 6 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 194), as amended, is amended by striking "office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia" and by striking "office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia," and by

inserting in lieu of each such phrase "domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 108. Docket: A separate docket shall be maintained for the domestic relations branch. There shall be recorded in such docket the actions taken at each stage of each action and proceeding instituted or conducted in the branch.

SEC. 109. Process: Service of process for the domestic relations branch shall be made by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia or by any of his authorized assistants. Service of process for the domestic relations branch may also be had by publication in the same manner as service of process is had by publication for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 110. Rules: The judges of the domestic relations branch, with the approval of the chief judge of the court, shall by rules prescribe the fees, charges, and costs and the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure in actions and proceedings in the domestic relations branch. Such rules shall neither abridge, enlarge, nor modify the substantive rights of any litigant. Except as otherwise specifically provided by such rules, the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall govern in the branch.

SEC. 111. Appeals: Any party aggrieved by any final or interlocutory order or judgment entered in the domestic relations branch shall have the same right of appeal available in respect to any final or interloctory order or judgment entered in the civil branch of the court.

SEC. 112. Sessions: The domestic relations branch, with at least one judge in attendance, shall be open for the transaction of business every day of the year except Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and legal holidays, and, if deemed necessary, may also hold night sessions.

SEC. 113. Jurisdiction of juvenile court not affected: Nothing contained in this act shall be construed so as to affect or diminish the jurisdiction of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, or any judge presiding therein.

SEC. 114. Appropriations authorized: Appropriations for expenses necessary for the operation of the domestic relations branch, including personal services, are hereby authorized.

SEC. 115. Effective dates: This act, except sections 105, 106, and 107, shall take effect upon its approval. Sections 105, 106, and 107 shall take effect 30 days after the appointment and qualification of the 3 additional judges authorized by this act to be appointed to the court.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the committee amendment be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SERVICES TO OLDER PERSONS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, in the folklore of India there is a legend about four blind men who could never agree on the nature of reality. One day a stranger put them to the test. "Which of you is the wisest?" he asked. "I am," they all replied. "Then," said the stranger, "we shall have to prove which of you is the wisest. Standing here is a strange beast called an elephant. Each of you shall tell me what he is like."

The first blind man felt the trunk and cried, "The elephant is like a huge snake."

The second blind man felt the leg, and cried, "No; the elephant is like a huge tree."

The third blind man felt the body and cried, "No, no; the elephant is like a huge granary."

The fourth blind man seized hold of the tail and cried, "No, no, no; you are all wrong, the elephant is like a whip."

The crowd laughed heartily, but an old man noted for his wisdom said: "Thus it is with all men who see only part of the truth."

To perceive and serve the whole, rather than its separate parts, is the object, Mr. Chairman, of a bill I am introducing today on behalf of the older persons of our country.

I hardly need to describe for this body the plight so many of them face. We all know that while in the past half century our total population has doubled, the number of persons 65 and over has quadrupled. In 1900, there were only 3 million older persons, or 4.1 percent of the population. Today, over 8.5 percent of our people—or 14 million—are 65 and over. By 1975, this is expected to rise to 21 million, or over 12.5 percent. With an increase in numbers have also come deep-seated social changes. As our economy has moved from one based primarily upon agriculture to one of extensive industrialization, our older citizens have been shunted to an increasingly insecure, dependent, and helpless position. Many have inadequate financial resources for maintaining themselves and their families as independent and self-respecting members of their communities. Many are poorly clothed, ill-housed, underfed, sick. Hundreds are driven by frustration and despair to mental hospitals or general hospitals. Thousands live isolated, lonely lives. It is not too much to say that our older people are becoming the displaced persons of our country. Men and women over 65 are being consigned by the thousands to an early physical and spiritual decay.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, we have consigned to the scrap heap large numbers of the most deserving of our society—those persons of and above age 65.

Five years ago, when I first introduced a resolution calling for a survey of aging by a select committee of the House, there was need for a study of older persons and their problems. That need still exists, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated last spring by filing the select committee resolution for the fourth consecutive session. In recent months, however, I have become convinced that there is a greater need for action than for study.

Recent research, culminating in two important publications by the Council of State Governments and the Twentieth Century Fund, convincingly demonstrates that the problems of older persons—in income, health, housing, recreation, and rehabilitation—are palpably acute, and cannot longer be ignored.

Through amendments to the social-security law, proposed changes in the housing law, and mounting activities in many segments of our society, some relief is on its way. I commend and support all of these developments. But the sum of all of them will not equal the task to be accomplished. Income is basic, but income alone is not enough. Housing is essential, but although a roof over one's head is a shelter against the elements, it provides little protection against the ravages of social isolation, loneliness, and despair.

We need, Mr. Chairman, a fresh approach. We need a new, broad program of action by all levels of government and private groups alike, which will treat an older person as a whole personality, with total and related personal needs.

Such, I believe, is the bill I am introducing today, which, if enacted, would be entitled "The Services to Older Persons Act."

After a statement of the need for such legislation, this measure contains the following declaration of policy:

First, to help to assure to older persons an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;

Second, to help enable older persons to achieve a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens;

Third, to help to provide older persons, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;

Fourth, to help older persons to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions of their years;

Fifth, to help to rehabilitate and to restore to independent, useful lives in their homes, to the fullest extent possible, older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;

Sixth, to help to assist older persons to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages, in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civic activities;

Seventh, to help to assure that older persons, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework; and

Eighth, to help to relieve the problems of older persons through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging.

And how are these policies to be served, Mr. Chairman? They are to be served by the States, communities, and nonprofit organizations supported by a

moderate program of grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. Grants are of three types. Title II provides for planning grants, to enable States to develop new programs or improve existing programs which will further the declaration of policy. Title III provides for project grants which will enable communities or nonprofit organizations to sponsor rehabilitation programs, recreational activities, golden-age clubs, employment surveys, "meals on wheels," adult education courses, craft fairs, "friendly visitor" programs, to mention a few. Title IV provides small grants to selected institutions and organizations for research on the causes of aging, and ways in which the olden years may become the golden years. Finally, there is a separate title providing for the creation within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a Bureau of Older Persons to provide the national scope and focus this pressing problem requires.

Mr. Chairman, I propose next week to talk in greater detail about this proposal, and the needs of our older citizens which it intends to meet.

Our older persons have a right to lead proud, productive, and independent lives. It is said life begins at 40. Let us make sure that it does not end at 65.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Comimttee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1289) to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill, and the amendment thereto, to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was order to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HYDE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HYDE moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia for further study.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HYDE) there were—ayes 27, noes 50.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therewith a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTING FARMERS FROM TAX ON GASOLINE USED FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, Report No. 1684, which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

ARAB-ISRAEL RELATIONS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in Arab-Israel relations have brought the situation in the Middle East dangerously near the point of combustion. The conflict over Israel, about the size of New Jersey and with only 1,700,000 people, may very well be the spark that ignites a dreadful worldwide conflagration. In the heated crossfire of Arab-Israel accusations it becomes difficult to sift facts from emotionally biased reports. With the peace of the world at stake, it is imperative that we make every effort to understand the events that have led to the present dangerous impasse.

The land known as Palestine passed from conqueror to conqueror throughout the centuries of its history. Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Moslems, Mamelukes, and Ottoman Turks all ruled over it for substantial periods. During World War I Palestine fell under British military control. In 1917 the British Government, with the approval of the Allied Powers, issued the Balfour Declaration which stated that the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was looked upon favorably. The wording of the declaration is ambiguous, however, so that it is difficult to determine the exact intent of the statement. Nevertheless, Zionists acted upon the assumption that the Balfour Declaration was a promise of a political as well as a spiritual homeland for the Jewish people.

At the time of the Balfour Declaration Arabs in Palestine outnumbered Jews 10 to 1. Between the 2 wars, especially under the impetus of the horrors of Nazi persecution, immigration swelled the Jewish population so that by 1938 the ratio of Arabs to Jews had decreased to 2 to 1. Arab fears and resentment grew as the Jewish population multiplied. From 1933 to 1939 Arab unrest exploded in a series of rebellions. The British, to assuage Arab misgivings, issued the white paper of 1939 which rejected the idea of a Jewish state, put a stop to the extension of Jewish land purchases, and stipulated that after 5 years further Jewish immigration would depend on Arab agreement. With the outbreak of World War II, Jewish protests against the white paper came to a temporary halt in favor of united action against Germany. When the end of the European conflict brought release to the pitiful remnants of Hitler's concentration camps, widespread humanitarian sentiment sympathized with the Jewish refugees in their efforts to break through Britain's anti-immigration policy.

Britain turned the problem over to the United Nations. On November 29, 1947, the General Assembly by two votes more than the necessary two-thirds resolved to adopt a partition plan for Palestine that established an Arab state, a Jewish state, and an international regime in Jerusalem; the British were to withdraw their troops by August 1, 1948, while the three new entities were to come into being on October 1, 1948.

Immediately after announcement of the partition plan heavy Arab-Jewish fighting broke out in Palestine. The United Nations Palestine Commission reported to the Security Council "organized efforts by strong Arab elements inside and outside Palestine to prevent the implementation of the Assembly's plan of partition and to thwart its objectives by threats and acts of violence, including armed incursions into Palestinian territory." The situation further deteriorated because Great Britain, which remained responsible for law and order as mandatory power, devoted its efforts to liquidating its administration and evacuating its troops.

Britain terminated its mandate on May 14, 1948. The same day the Jews of Palestine proclaimed the independence of the State of Israel. Within a few

hours the United States recognized Israel's provisional government. The following day the armies of five Arab states invaded the nascent country. Nine month later, on February 24, 1949, Israel and its principal antagonist, Egypt, signed an armistice. By July 20, 1949, four other Arab states had followed Egypt's lead. The armistice agreements changed the boundary picture from that envisioned by the U. N. partition plan. Israel ended up with a major portion of the Negev Desert and thus with more territory than the partition plan allotted; the Arab countries bordering Palestine received about 2,000 square miles of territory formerly in mandatory Palestine.

With the advent of peace, a peace broken by sporadic raids by hostile Arab neighbors, Israel set about laying the foundations of a modern democratic nation. Burdened by the influx of some 750,000 refugees in 6 years—many of whom were too old or broken by disease and ill-treatment to be anything but liabilities to the new state—hampered by economic boycotts and blockades, impeded in economic matters by a scarcity of raw materials and only 0.33 acre of arable land per person, the gallant Irsaelis searched for raw materials, turned parched deserts into green pastures, found food and lodging and a future for their fellow Jews. The feverish development pace went on in spite of troublesome Arab harassment—the Government of Israel reports 1,100 Israeli civilians murdered or wounded by Arab raiding parties since the armistice agreements.

On May 11, 1949, Israel won admission to the United Nations. But Arab determination to blot out the Jewish homeland has never abated and public statements by Arab officials continue to declare their adamant refusal to accept the existence of Israel. The purchase of arms last September by Egypt from Communist sources has added to the tension in the area. In view of Arab declarations, it is no wonder that 1.7 million Israelis are fearful of the results of arming their 40 million avowed enemies.

Sources of tension between the Arabs and Israelis are numerous. The plight of the 800,000 refugees who fled Palestine during the war is perhaps the most formidable. Two hundred thousand Palestine Arabs now squat in the Gaza strip, within sight of their former homes; over 450,000 are in Jordan, a physically poor country which welcomed its fellow Arabs but is having great difficulty absorbing them into the economy; Syria and Lebanon also have sizable numbers of Palestine refugees. Israel has offered the refugees compensation for their land, while the Arabs are holding out for repatriation.

With the combined purpose of easing the refugee situation and improving the economic situation in the Middle East, the United States and the United Nations have been urging a plan to harness the rivers of the Jordan Valley to provide irrigated land and power in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Israel. After several years of painstaking negotiation, the four countries concerned essentially agree on the method and division of the water. But the tense political situation at present prevents their going ahead with plans for economic cooperation. Meanwhile Israel warns that it must go ahead with irrigation unilaterally unless final agreement with the other Jordan River countries can soon be reached. Should Israel proceed to divert waters of the Jordan to the Negev, as it plans to do in the event of further delay on the international agreement, it is unlikely that the Arab countries will stand quietly by.

The most recent incident in the long series of clashes between the Israelis and Arabs occurred on the Sea of Galilee. While the Sea of Galilee lies within Israel, the border of Syria is only 11 yards from the water's edge. According to Israeli record, 25 cases of shootings by Syrians at Israeli boats occurred during 1955. On December 11 Syrian shots hit an Israeli police launch; that night Israel launched a retaliatory raid, killing over 40 Syrians. The United Nations has censured Israel for violence. And a most unfortunate reaction has developed from the Galilee incident—the tendency in the United States to throw up our hands and say, "A curse on both your houses." Now is not the time to lose our patience and our perspective, or we shall abandon the whole region to the Communists. We must pursue an Israeli-Arab settlement based on justice and moral principle with determination, vigor, and persistence.

To do this, we in America must recognize certain basic facts. First, that Israel is a state which now exists. It is the promised land of Moses and of a people who for thousands of years have been denied the homeland to which they were entitled. Israel was Jewish before it was Arab, and it will continue to be the homeland of the Jews. For that we have the word of the prophets and of the Almighty.

Israel is also an island of progress and democracy in a large sea of Arabic feudalism. It is making the desert green and bringing industry and opportunity to a barren wasteland. America owes two debts to Israel, one, for the fighting and suffering on the side of democracy during the trying times of the last World War, when the free world gravely needed allies and friends. It is interesting to note that the Arabs, the Arab League Nations, especially Egypt, were at best fainthearted and unreliable allies at our time of peril. They were mercenaries, and what we call "rice Christians." At the worst, they were openly hostile to our democracies, and avowedly and actively pro-Fascist. These things we must recall, not in vindictiveness, but to judge upon what basis we must calculate America's own self-interest. Israel was our friend, is our friend, and will continue to be our friend, if only we preserve her existence. Only Israel, in that area, shares our democratic heritage and has the technical skills, desire, and courage to be a true and valuable ally to America.

The second debt which America owes to Israel is that which one who saves the life of another owes the person he saves. That is to see to it that the person rescued has the necessary means to continue existing.

I repeat that this whole problem must be solved upon long term considerations, and upon justice. However, the solution lies not in inaction, hesitation, nor in weak-kneed, pusillanimous efforts without direction, nor decision. We cannot ignore the existence of the problem, but rather must take positive, vigorous, and immediate action toward its solution. The Arabs shall have justice, but they shall not have Israel, no matter how determined they are. There is a short term approach which we must take to preserve the status quo, so that there will be an Israel to discuss when we approach the longer term problems.

I offer the following for the short-term approach to the problem. I hope that the State Department will seize upon it, and cease its indecisive malingering.

First. Immediate guaranty of the borders of all parties, to allay fear and suspicion on the part of all. That guaranty must be backed up by the necessary force. This should be done jointly with Britain and France, or within the United Nations if possible, but by the United States, alone, if need be.

Second. International patrol of the Gaza strip, again by the United Nations, or by France, Britain, and the United States.

Third, Immediate instruction to the Arabs that unless they cease accepting Russian arms at once, and notify the United States of their intent to do so within 48 hours, we will take necessary steps to protect not only the interests of America and the free world but of Israel, and that we will ship to Israel, forthwith, such offensive and defensive arms as we might deem necessary to Israel's defense.

Fourth. Upon refusal of Egypt to cease accepting Russian arms we should then see to it that Israel has the weapons she needs.

The time to act is now. It is much cheaper to prevent a war than to fight one. I hope that our country will take what steps are necessary, to prevent the war which is surely coming in the Middle East, rather than have to step into a hot war to help a democracy to defend itself from strangulation.

The longer range problems can be approached more deliberately, and I know that in their consideration, our State Department will consider wisely the human needs of the refugees, the shortage of water which affects all, and the fact that Israel is an existing state, whose borders are as sacred to us as our own.

CAR QUOTAS VERSUS SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, small business today is confronted with many problems. Owners of small businesses find themselves under more and more economic pressures which threaten their existence. The trend of the day is toward monopoly and restricted trade

practices. For many years small business suffered from excessive Government regulation and red tape. Now the tendency of the Government toward paternalism for big business is reflected in trade practices which make it increasingly difficult for small business to survive.

A paramount example of this situation is shown in the plight of automobile dealers throughout the Nation.

Auto dealers constantly are having their hands tied by the manufacturers in that they are being forced to accept an assigned quota of cars regardless of local or national market conditions.

Without question the present situation is unwarranted and unjustified. The dealer should not be forced to accept these cars under the stringent conditions set forth by the manufacturer. Somebody has to pay for the cars whether or not they are sold to the public, and often the franchised dealer is left holding the bag. In some cases the franchised dealer is forced to resell a part of his car quota to other dealers for resale as new "used cars." This appears to be the dealer's only recourse in light of the present situation.

Legislation may be needed to prohibit the manufacturer from forcing cars on the dealer if he is unable to sell them on his market. Yet, I would be reluctant to see it become necessary to take recourse to legislation. There are too many bills on the statute books already. However, something should be done to resolve this apparent injustice. The manufacturer himself is the proper person to settle the problem by lowering his own quota requirements. Understandably, competition among the big manufacturers is responsible for this situation. Manufacturers want to sell more cars. But, by doing so, they may be creating a monster which can destroy their own industry if, in the process of selling cars, they bankrupt the automobile dealers of America.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is not blaming this particular matter on any Government policy?

Mr. SIKES. This quite clearly is a policy of the manufacturers. I do not know the attitude of the Government toward this policy; I trust that it recognizes there are dangers involved.

WAS 1955 A BOOM YEAR?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, going behind the make-believe statements in the Economic Report of the President, the facts in that report show that there has been no real economic growth since mid-1953.

The total output of goods and services last year was $2,344 per capita, or $1 less than the 1953 output valued in 1955 prices. This record fails to reflect normal increases in productivity, and it fails to maintain the rate of growth which took place in the preceding two decades.

The actual output of goods and services last year was only 8 percent above 1952. In the previous 3 years there was a 21 percent growth—measured in 1955 prices. In the last 3 years real increases in goods and services of all kinds have averaged only 2.8 percent per year, which is less than the rate of productivity increases. From 1939 through 1952, the average yearly rate of economic growth—measured in 1955 prices—was 6.8 percent.

SMALL INCREASE IN PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

During the past 3 years there have been a number of fundamental changes in Federal policies intended to channel larger shares of the national income into corporate profits and into incomes of the owners of interest-bearing debt. There was never any question but what these changes would succeed in their direct purpose. In 1955 corporations took $4.5 billion more in profits, after taxes, than in 1952, and in addition, took $4.1 billion more income from the generous depreciation and amortization allowances recently provided for in the tax law. Furthermore, individuals who receive their income from interest received $3.2 billion more such income than in 1952.

Plainly, however, there has been a failure to attain the broader purpose which has been claimed for the recent Federal policies—which was to encourage increased investment in new productive capacity, which the country needs. Although corporations took $8.6 billion more in net income, after taxes, than in 1952, their outlays for plant and equipment—including replacement items—was only $2.1 billion more than in 1952. Considering the increased prices of machinery and the increased construction costs which have taken place in the last 3 years, it is doubtful if there has been a real increase in productive capacity—an objective for which consumers, farmers, and small businesses have paid dearly.

INFLATION IN BIG CORPORATION PRICES AND PROFITS

The President's report boasts that the supposed achievements of the past 3 years have been accomplished without the specious aid of price inflation. That is just specious analysis of the facts. There has been a galloping inflation in both prices and profits in the big-business sectors of the economy—particularly during the last year and a half—and the administration has maintained the overall buying power of the dollar by policies which have brought about a rapid deflation in the competitive segments, namely the farm- and small-business segments.

Prices of steel, aluminum, copper, and other metals have jumped 16 percent since the first of 1953, and the profits in these industries last year, after taxes, was 13 percent of the stockholders' investment. Prices of all machinery and transportation equipment together have increased 9 percent, and the after-taxes profit rate in these industries last year was 15 percent.

Prices of textiles and apparel have gone down 5 percent since the first of 1953, and the profit rate in these industries last year was only 5 percent. These are typically small-business industries. Prices received by farmers have fallen 16 percent since the first of 1953. The wholesale price index of all products other than farm and food products has increased 4 percent within the last year alone.

The tax relief which was given the big corporations in 1953 and 1954, on the theory that these corporations would be encouraged to expand capacity, has merely provided an incentive for raising prices and taking more profits.

In the first 9 months of last year, profit rates on stockholders' investment in the giant manufacturing corporations—those with more than $100 million of assets—were 27 percent above the already high rates of 1952. In contrast, the profit rate of smaller corporations—those with less than a quarter of a million of assets—had dropped 39 percent from 1952.

The number of business firms has increased only 6,500 per year in the past 3 years. From 1948 through 1952 the yearly increase was 52,000. About 11,000 small businesses on the Dun and Bradstreet list failed last year. This was a failure rate of 42 per each 10,000 firms listed, as compared to a yearly rate of 20 per each 10,000 in the 10 years before this administration took office.

STAGGERING INCREASES IN THE NATIONAL DEBT

The present administration has sold or otherwise liquidated Federal assets of considerable value. The synthetic rubber plants are but one example. The administration has likewise curtailed services to the public. For example, loans for small business such as were made by RFC have been virtually stopped. With all this, however, the Federal debt has not been reduced as promised, but has been increased by the greatest amounts in peace-time history. Yet at the same time the debt of State and local governments has increased $12.6 billion and home mortgage debt has increased $37.7 billion.

In the last 3 years the Federal debt has been increased by $13.4 billion, to an all-time high. During the previous 3 years the increase was only $10.2 billion, and this included costs of the Korean war, plus substantial military and economic aid to our Allies. In the 3 post-war years following World War II, the Federal debt was reduced by $25.8 billion.

NIGHTMARE IN RED—A GREAT PUBLIC CONTRIBUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within a month, millions of Americans, through the television facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., have had the opportunity to view and

hear an exceptional document called Nightmare in Red.

This repetition of a national network production within so short a span of time reflects a most extraordinary public reaction and a press reaction which we are compelled to recognize.

Nightmare in Red is not an emotional appeal to any stratum of our national intellects. It is the careful, painstaking compilation of thousands upon thousands of feet of factual, unembellished motion picture film collected from 64 different sources, some of which may not even now be revealed.

The resourceful acquisition of the scenes in the television production is a story almost as melodramatic as the finished product is relentlessly and grimly unemotional.

Some of the footage of Nightmare in Red never has been seen publicly before; some of it has not been viewed for decades. The earliest of the material dates back to 1895; the latest dates as recently as the construction of the Iron Curtain after World War II.

All of it was culled from film archives in England, France, Western Germany and Italy; from musty hideaways in the Flea Market in Paris; from the private collections of Germans, Japanese, and even members of the Russian Czar's palace guard.

In the nature of a tribute to the man who achieved Nightmare in Red I can give no greater emphasis to his devotion to fact and truthful exposition than to remind you that it is the same person who so brilliantly created the memorable Victory at Sea films for NBC, Henry Salomon.

In his Nightmare in Red production he delivers for all Americans, an unforgettable history of the growth of communism in Russia up to the time of Stalin's death.

Some of our most widely read newspapers saw fit to cast aside tradition by writing editorials in advance of the showing of the film. Some of our great veterans' and service organizations requested showings in advance for their national conventions.

But most impressive was the public reaction after the National Broadcasting Co.'s presentation of Nightmare in Red on December 27, of last year.

So great was the national response for a repetition of the Salomon production that the sponsor and the network perforce scheduled it for repeat performance January 24 on the Armstrong Circle Theatre.

In presenting the world menace that is communism, this film is a true public service.

TREE PLANTING AS METHOD OF ENDING NEWSPRINT SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, our domestic economy is plagued by the major problem of the farm crisis. However, at the same time it is being heckled by a number of other problems of lesser magnitude, but of real importance; and one such is the newsprint shortage faced by our newspaper and magazine publishers.

I mention these two problems in the same breath because, I believe that something can be done, on a long-range basis—to at least partially solve both problems, merely by proper emphasis on certain aspects of a program now pending before the Congress, namely, the soil bank idea. I believe that if the Congress acts wisely and well in adopting into law the soil-bank program we can encourage farmers to divert acreage now devoted to crops that are in surplus to the cultivation of trees that are particularly suited to the manufacture of newsprint, which is in short supply.

The encouragement of the farm woodlot is not a new nor a novel idea; it has been done before. Pennsylvania's pioneer conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, fought long and hard to preserve timberlands and to encourage new plantings. Former Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, though often derided as something of a visionary proposed his "tree belt" which was to provide windbreaks in the Great Plains areas. Tree planting has long been a part of the agricultural conservation program.

As currently as this moment, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina, is proposing a plan to encourage the farmer to plant trees which would be designed to meet the growing needs for timber and pulp. When I read the gentleman's press announcement on January 5 I was both pleased and flattered, to discover that we were thinking along similar lines.

There is an urgent need for such a program. There is little need for me to recite the evidence showing the great magnitude of the farm problem. The farmer has been caught in a squeeze between falling income and increased costs. There is no indication of a reversal of this trend in the immediate future, unless, God forbid, Mr. Dulles unartistically goes over that brink on his next roll of the dice.

Perhaps we are not so familiar with the newsprint shortage. It is acute. Already in the State of Pennsylvania one newspaper has dropped its editorial page; in Colorado one other newspaper has printed complete issues without advertising, a necessary ingredient to the movement of goods in our competitive economy; while in Syracuse, N. Y., still another drops its classified advertisements in some editions. Newspapers have been rationed, some having had their allotment curtailed as much as 13½ percent.

This is a serious condition. One that could even take on vital significance for the Congress and the country if the administration clings to the policy of letting the people's representatives learn of vital and delicate shifts in its foreign policies through the medium of favored publications, it becomes imperative that there be sufficient paper upon which to print these important announcements.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has seen fit to conduct hearings to determine whether shady practices have been the cause of newsprint appearing in on-the-spot markets at prices more than 40 percent higher than prices quoted in contracts, which are being curtailed. Whether there is and has been a black market, the fact remains that the sale, on-the-spot at the higher price, is possible only because of the shortage.

Our good neighbor to the north, Canada, has been supplying about 50 percent of all our newsprint. This is not enough to meet the current requirements, and Canada can no longer produce enough to meet the increasing demand. So we have all the elements here for action to encourage the growth of the raw material for newsprint as a new profitable farm crop.

The vehicle for that encouragement is present in the soil-bank proposals. Now that President Eisenhower has endorsed this proposal, and now that the Department of Agriculture, which so recently was denouncing it as a costly, impractical, and unnecessary Democratic scheme, assures us that the soil bank is the keystone of the administration's new farm program it seems certain that it will be enacted.

The soil-bank proposal recommended by Mr. Eisenhower has several weaknesses, particularly in connection with the acreage-reserve program. Under this program farmers would be asked to plant fewer acres than they have been allotted. For permitting up to 30 million acres to lie idle, farmers would be given certificates which they could convert into cash, or for which they would receive grain from our surplus stocks, provided the idle land is not used for any other purpose which will produce food or fiber which is also in surplus.

The basic weakness here is that the land remains idle, and we are forced to continue to pay farmers for not planting for an indefinite period, or else at some future date we shall once more begin to build up surpluses again. Then there is the problem of policing the land. This problem has been pointed up in testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when the question was raised as to how cattle could be prevented from wandering onto the idle land and grazing on grass or anything else which might be growing without cultivation.

Aside from these two objections to the soil-bank program as so far advanced, it seems to me that it is unthinkable that the American farmers would even consider letting some of their best land going to weeds. It should be even more unthinkable that this Government would consider adopting a policy of encouraging farmers to grow nothing but weeds. This need not, and should not, be our policy. A constructive alternate course is to put that land to work growing something we need—trees.

If this land is planted in trees, any of the fast-growing softwoods, such as Virginia pine, Banks pine, poplar, and so forth, depending upon local conditions, then not only is the land out of production of a surplus crop, there is little attraction for wandering cattle to graze, and the farmer is on his way—albeit a long way—to the establishment of a new crop for himself; a crop where there is a ready-made market for many, many

years into the future. We then curtail the problem of some surpluses, and establish a crop which can be managed in such a manner so as to provide maximum protection against runoffs, thus reducing flood danger on the main-stem streams, as well as holding valuable topsoil on the farms. Such pulpwood lots in the plains area could be so situated as to provide maximum protection against wind erosion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a very carefully prepared speech and I congratulate him. I come from a district which does not have very much farming in it and I think I would know if there was. Throughout the years I have consistently supported legislation for the agricultural communities of our country, because I felt it was a national problem and I felt that they were entitled to compensatory relief, the same as industry receives in respect to tariffs, where a farmer buys in a protected market, but his farm surplus commodities sell in an unprotected market. Basically there is a challenge; it is not merely a question of any farmer getting help as such but a matter of establishing a national policy, so that we can have a living and a dynamic agriculture which is vitally important at all times to protect all farmers in the world of today and tomorrow. We should do everything we possibly can to keep alive a dynamic agriculture in America. The thought enters my mind, under the soil-bank program recommended, Has the gentleman any views as to what may be the plight or benefits or disadvantages to the family-type farmer if such a program should be enacted into law as proposed?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his remarks, and I would say as far as the family-type farmer is concerned—and that is the type of farmer that I am familiar with; that is the type of farmer that resides in my district of Pennsylvania—I have talked to a number of farmers within weeks since the soil bank idea has been advanced, and they are not at all persuaded that it holds their salvation. They are afraid that they are just going to make further cuts in their already short and small production. I, too, am concerned. It is impossible to ask and it is impossible to expect the farmers who through the years have been growing a very limited number of acres to make even further cuts on a voluntary basis. I am afraid that the farmer may at first be inclined to go along with the soil-bank idea, because it seems like a good idea, but after awhile he will be awfully tempted to put those idle acres to some use, any use; some of whch may be actually in violation of the soil-bank program. I think one of the greatest weaknesses in the soil-bank idea is the difficulty in policing it, and my thought is, if we get the farmer to commit himself to a particular long-range crop, such as trees, that the job of policing it, avoiding the necessity of checking up to see what the farmer is doing with those so-called idle acres, will be greatly reduced.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Am I correct in believing that the conservation part of the proposed program provides for such measures as the gentleman refers to?

Mr. QUIGLEY. As I understand the program as it has been so far outlined to the Congress, the conservation aspect would do this: My main concern is over the other aspect of the President's program. I am in full agreement and quite enthusiastic about the conservation aspect, but it it the so-called acreage reserve aspect, which is really new or the novel idea, that I am concerned about.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Is it not a fact that the great fallacy, in your opinion, with the present proposed soil bank is that it does nothing to supplement or to replace the income which has been lost by the small family-type farmer over a period of years by taking the cuts in acreage, which is the very thing that has brought about the emergency in the farm program? In other words, it will bring income in future cuts but does nothing as a stopgap measure to replace the income which has placed the farmer in his present economic plight.

Mr. QUIGLEY. That I think is correct. Over the long haul it could prove effective. I see no immediate relief to the farmer in the program.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is true. In the original idea of the soil bank, the people who proposed the soil bank, the Farm Bureau Federation and the farm leaders who have proposed the soil bank, they proposed it as a long-term measure of taking care of the farmer but not as an emergency solution, which this administration is now suggesting it is. It is not going to do the job of taking the farmer out of the cost-price squeeze in which he is in right now.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I wish I could disagree with the gentleman from Tennessee. I am afraid the soil bank is not going to give the farmer the emergency relief which he desperately needs.

I am informed that in Pennsylvania alone there are 1,500,000 acres not being used now that could be made into pulpwood growing areas. Land taken out of crop production might add another 1,500,000 acres in our State alone. Most of the other States could, I believe, profit from such a program.

Some softwoods may be planted 3,000 to 4,000 to the acre, with the first thinning taking place in 10 years. Such tree farms have produced 40 cords of logs to the acre. The usual plantings of evergreen trees is 1,000 to the acre.

The United States Department of Agriculture in Beltsville has been experimenting since 1935 with a hybrid poplar which is disease resistant and grown from cuttings. Six-inch pieces are cut off all around a tree and stuck into the ground. Each piece will take root and develop fast. Wherever it might be practical to use the poplar, the problem of replanting becomes relatively simple; one which any farmer can do without the necessity of a period of apprenticeship in forestry.

The gentleman from North Carolina is approaching the problem of an incentive for this type of program on the basis of payment over a period of 5 years, similar to payments under ACP, after which period farmers could borrow a sum representing a substantial percentage of the growth increment as it relates to the value of pulpwood and timber when they are harvested.

My thinking has been on a slightly different incentive. I would suggest to the Committee on Agriculture that it consider making the planting of rapidly maturing softwoods a requirement for certification under the acreage reserve program, with issuance of the certificates to continue until the initial harvest. Perhaps it would be well to provide for a slightly higher payment for the planting of trees in land coming under the conservation reserve plan.

Whether the idea suggested here has the most merit, or whether the incentive for the type of program suggested is something entirely different from the approach of the gentleman from North Carolina and myself, I believe the diversion of acreage to the new crop is the only practical method of carrying out the soil bank program.

If we do this we can justify the expenditure on a broader basis; in other words we can charge the cost up to a number of legitimate functions of Government, rather than just to the agriculture program. Since the beginning of our Nation we have assisted new industries to develop, either by the use of the protective tariff or in more recent times by the rapid tax amortization. So whatever the cost of the soil bank proposal may be, when we use it to encourage the development of an expanded newsprint industry, we take away the stigma of handoutism. Furthermore we eliminate some of the cost and red tape of enforcement. Finally we have helped diversify farming, so that farmers do not concentrate on the crops which show up so frequently as surpluses.

I am confident the Committee on Agriculture will give full consideration to these proposals, as well as any other proposal which will enable these idle acres to be turned to a useful purpose.

TIME TO TAKE A STAND FOR PRINCIPLES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the Reds have launched a new political offensive

and America must be on guard against more appeasement, no matter how diluted or subtle.

This time the tension is stirred up over Taiwan, and the offensive comes in the wake of a steady and substantial buildup of Communist arms. Once again, we are being treated to a show of political blackmail: at the risk of being charged with incurring war, we are told to doublecross an ally, Nationalist China; feed the Red tiger with more free world territory; and, worst of all, to renounce principle by breaking our solemnly given word by repudiating a treaty.

Perhaps it is a coincidence that Prime Minister Anthony Eden is coming to Washington just at the time the Red Chinese propaganda campaign is being geared to crisis pitch; certainly, Mr. Eden's visit is opportune if the Eisenhower administration utilizes the occasion to impress upon him the firm conviction of the American people that we are through with attempting to buy peace by sacrificing our allies and our principles. This lesson should not be difficult for Mr. Eden to comprehend, for he, himself, in a memorable example of moral revolt, resigned from His Majesty's government when Chamberlain offered up Czechoslovakia as a sacrifice to Hitler at Munich for peace in our times, a peace which only turned out to be the prelude to World War II.

From Munich to Korea to Indochina, the story is all the same: Surrender before threats, new demands by totalitarian powers, new concessions by the democracies, intermittent blood-baths, extension of tyranny, and consolidation of Communist gains.

I raise my voice at this time, Mr. Speaker, to sound the warning that with the development of the Taiwan crisis we may expect to witness a step-up in the attempted brain-washing of the American people. We will be lured by the siren call: "Is a small piece of real estate in a distant land worth the risk of war? Is America ready to take the risk of plunging the world into an atomic holocaust for a tiny, insignificant speck on the map?" The chant will be taken up and sung in a variety of tones and keys—America will be made to look like the offender—the White House will be besieged with the usual peace petitions—public sentiment will be primed for another sacrifice to insatiable appetites of aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and the Members of this body, that Taiwan is no farther away than our conscience—the issue is as large as American honor—it is as vital as our national dedication to freedom and liberty and self-determination for all peoples—priceless principles for which our patriots' blood has been shed since the establishment of this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, my concern arises from a close and careful study of these matters in our day. You will recall, I am sure, that when the subject of the Conference at the Summit was first raised, I took the floor to warn against it as a diplomatic pitfall. You well remember that I also urged that certain conditions be established before we consented to sit down with the representatives of Red China—that all war prisoners held by all Communist powers be released; that the terms of the Korean Armistice be reviewed and the violations corrected; that the Red international conspiracy give recognition to the fact that subversion and penetration by its agents into the internal affairs of other governments constituted war just the same as outright aggression by violence; and that such war by subversion and infiltration be renounced.

Well, we all know the sorry results of Geneva—the blush was off that rose even before it bloomed. We know now, what many of us here in this Chamber realized before the Geneva Conference sessions were held, that the Communists used the meetings as a device to gain political prestige and for the wholesale manufacture of propaganda favorable to the Red cause.

Now that there is a new Red political offensive for the aggrandizement of additional territory, and in view of the forthcoming visit of Mr. Eden, who will no doubt press the desires of Great Britain for a removal of trade barriers between the East and West and for the withdrawal of American opposition to Red China's admission into the United Nations, I think that it is time we reshaped our whole foreign policy with a view toward the establishment of a more decisive, more clear-cut, more forthright, and forward-looking foreign policy than that which we have been following. The moment is at hand when the free world must refuse to yield a single inch of territory to the Communists, and the United States is the only country which can reasonably and effectively assume the leadership in doing this. We will have to deviate from our past performance of vacillation, softness, and indecision if we are ever going to win the cold war, and we are going to have to say this in no uncertain terms, both to our Communist enemies and to our appeaser friends. There is no better time to make this declaration than in an election year when the Communists least expect us to stand firm. Mr. Eden, being an astute politician himself, might also profit from a real show of steadfastness to principle at a time when political seats are at stake in the country which he is about to visit.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times of Sunday, January 22, by Henry Lieberman, dealing with the Taiwan question:

PEIPING STEPS UP THE TENSION OVER TAIWAN

(By Henry Lieberman)

HONGKONG, January 21.—Communist China stoked up the tension pot in Taiwan (Formosa) Strait this week under more propaganda pressure. It added stronger words and a heavier than usual off shore island shelling to the brew of armed incidents, psychological tussling, and military preparations which had continued to simmer over the small fire in that area.

The desultory ambassadorial-level talks between the United States and the Chinese Communists went on at Geneva. But after accusing the United States of dragging out the talks and hinting that it might pull out, Peiping announced bluntly that it would not accept a United States formula for renunciation of force in the Taiwan area subject to the "right of individual and collective self-defense" for both sides.

REASSERT CLAIM

The Chinese Communists called again for a conference at the foreign ministers' level to relieve the tensions. At the same time, however, they reasserted their claim to Taiwan and maintained that the United States had no right of defense in an area where the latter has undertaken to help defend Taiwan and the Penghu (Pescadores) Islands.

Meanwhile Peiping is again accusing the United States of occupying Taiwan, stepping up military activity there and sending planes to intrude into its territorial air in provocative acts.

The Chinese Communists also have seized upon the Dulles "brink of war" interview. Their propagandists have represented this as a renewed clamor for atomic war against the China mainland and declared that the "Chinese people cannot be intimidated." Psychological and political warfare, including the tension aspects of the "brink" technique as practiced in Peiping, are regarded by various observers here as a major aspect of the present picture in Taiwan Strait. But those holding such a view do not minimize the military danger along the east coast.

ARTILLERY FIRE

It has not been just a matter of words in Taiwan Strait. A 7-hour artillery exchange occurred in the Quemoy Island sector Thursday. It was the heaviest gunfire there since September 3, 1954, when Communists fired 6,000 shells at the Quemoy area in emphasizing the resumption of their Taiwan liberation campaign. On Thursday, Taipei announced, the Communists fired over 2,900 shells at Nationalist-held Quemoy and adjacent islands. The Nationalists pumped shells back at the Communists from their offshore positions.

Sporadic artillery exchanges of less intensity have been going on in the Quemoy sector for some time. Even at the height of the Geneva spirit the Communists continued to develop their coastal military potential and the Nationalists their offshore island defenses both in the Quemoy sector and in the Matsu sector farther up the Fukien coast.

Nationalist planes have been making regular reconnaissance flights over Communist positions and occasionally attacking concentrations of Communist shipping. There has been relatively little aerial contact, however, and the Chinese Communists have not tangled thus far with the United States Seventh Fleet destroyers patrolling Taiwan Strait.

NO ATTACK INDICATED

On Quemoy last month Lt. Gen. Liu Yu-chang, Nationalist commander there, said he had seen "no indications" that the Communists were planning an attack in that sector "in the near future." He added, however, that one could "not tell for sure" and that he was ready for an attack at any time.

According to other military sources there has been no dramatic numerical buildup in Communist troop strength along the east China coast in some time. But these sources point out that the Communists have long had enough troops for offshore-island operations and that continuing the technical buildup along the coast was now the important thing militarily.

The Chinese Communists have been developing their coastal strength in terms of such factors as communications, airfields, and artillery potential. In an obvious attempt to improve their supply situation in the Quemoy sector the Chinese Communists have constructed a causeway from the mainland to Amoy Island facing Quemoy on the east

and are constructing another from the mainland to Tateng Island 4 miles north of Quemoy.

Two-thirds of that Nationalist-held island is already within range of Communist artillery.

BUILDING RAILWAY

As part of the communications buildup the Chinese Communists have been constructing a railway leading from Yingtak on the existing Hangchow-Nanchang line southward into Fukien. The Nationalists believe that this supply route is to lead to Nanping with one branch extending from there to Foochow near Matsu and another continuing south to Amoy opposite Quemoy. A recent Peiping dispatch said the target date for completing this line had been advanced 1 year, indicating that the new target is sometime in 1956. Earlier reports had reached here that the Communists had built an improved coastal road between Foochow and Amoy along the feeder roads leading into this artery.

For some time now the Chinese Communists have been extending their coastal airfields southward. They have improved the field at Foochow and have been developing at least 6 new points 25 to 125 miles from Quemoy.

An airman in Taiwan said the staging bases would provide the Communists with advantages of time, space, and flexibility by forcing a dispersal of opposing air strength in the event of major hostilities. The Chinese Communists clearly aim to win Taiwan eventually. But the question of whether they will attack the offshore islands in the foreseeable future, and if so in what way, has become a general guessing game marked by varying points of view.

SHOWDOWN MOVE

Some believe the Communists may possibly attack Quemoy and Matsu before long to force a showdown and strike at Taiwan by going after the substantial number of Nationalist troops on the offshore islands. More believe the Communists will not attack because they do not want to risk a war with the United States, because they do not want to jeopardize their infant industrialization program, because they want to maximize the effectiveness of peaceful coexistence, and because they are not ready for a showdown.

Between these poles there is another school here that holds that while the Communists may not attack Quemoy or Matsu they may risk limited military maneuvers to dramatize the tension in Taiwan Strait. This school suggests the possibility of an intensified artillery barrage, air attacks or an assault on one or more small islands in either the Matsu or Quemoy complex.

In this connection, however, there seems to be the tricky question of how close to the brink you can get.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. BOLAND), on account of official business conducting hearings in New York for Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), from Thursday, January 26, 1956, to Tuesday, January 31, 1956, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, for 10 minutes on Monday, January 30.

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes on Thursday, February 2.

Mr. DOYLE, for 1 hour on Monday, January 30, in recognition and commemoration of the birthday of the 32d President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELANEY (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORRESTER and include extraneous material.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. AYRES and include articles written by Mr. HILLINGS in connection with his visit behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER and include a letter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. BENTLEY).

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. GRAY).

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. PELLY.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution designating the month of February in each year as American Heart Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on Wednesday, January 25, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Leong Ding Foon Quon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 30, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1425. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1955, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1426. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering the claims paid on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel during the 6-months period ending December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 207 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by Public Law 220, 82d Congress (5 U. S. C. 275 (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1427. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1428. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fifth and final annual report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics covering operations under Public Law 867, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1429. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the case of Liu Fo Lee, file A-9778380, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1430. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the case of Shun Ho aka Shun Hall, A-2990850, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1431. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the case of Trivan or Thomas Dadasovich, file 2774-P-150818, involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1432. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the cases of Boyan Petkoff Choukanoff, A-6776849, and Ekaterina Boyanova Choukanova, A-6776848, involving the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1433. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia,

transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs; to create and establish a public body corporate with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4363. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico; with amendment (Rept. No. 1679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5657. A bill to allow the use of certain property in Volusia County, Fla., for civil-defense purposes without payment of compensation to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress and House Resolution 105. (84th Cong.) (Rept. No. 1681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report relative to committee studies overseas pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601 (79th Cong.) (Rept. No. 1682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. KELLY of New York: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Study Mission to Europe pursuant to House Resolution 91 (84th Cong., 1st sess.) (Rept. No. 1683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8780 a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7871. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 (Rept. No. 1685). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 8826. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Altar of the Nation, located in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H., as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8827. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 8828. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 8829. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to facilitate the acquisition of rights-of-way for Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 8830. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to credit for retirement purposes the accumulated and accrued annual leave and unused sick leave of persons separated from the service with entitlement to immediate or deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 8831. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to make applicable to Members of Congress the current provisions of section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, relating to voluntary contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 8832. A bill to provide funds for construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., as authorized by the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 8833. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 8834. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to adjust the loan limitations of title II so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8835. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to farmers and stockmen for the purpose of refinancing existing debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 8836. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8837. A bill to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 8838. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to honor the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., the Furniture Capital of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 8839. A bill to protect and preserve the national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 8840. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to permit the employment of child labor in agriculture during the first 2 weeks of the regular school year; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 8841. A bill to provide for payment of a 6-months' death gratuity to certain survivors of officers or enlisted men of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who died on active duty after October 6, 1917, and with respect to whose deaths no such gratuity was payable; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 8842. A bill to establish a Domestic Relations Division of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 8843. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8844. A bill to provide for a dual banking system in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 8845. A bill to grant rural mail service to all patrons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 8846. A bill to authorize the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to charter production cost insurance associations to insure farmers against losses resulting from farming operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8847. A bill to correct an inequity resulting from the setting of the effective date of Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8848. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 8849. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the development, construction, and operation of an atomic-powered railway locomotive; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount exempted from the surtax on corporate taxable income from $25,000 to $50,000, and to permit a corporation with income tax liability for a taxable year of less than $100,000 to elect to pay its tax in 4 equal installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8851. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8852. A bill to correct an inequity resulting from the setting of the effective date of Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 8853. A bill to provide that measurement prior to planting of cotton-acreage allotments made at the request of farmers shall be without cost to them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8854. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to restore export markets for American cotton, prevent the loss of domestic markets for American cotton, and increase acreage allotments for the 1956 crop of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 8855. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a monetary allowance in lieu of providing a headstone or marker for the unmarked grave of a soldier or a member or former member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8856. A bill to provide that under certain conditions the remarried widow of a veteran of World War I may be restored to the compensation or pension rolls upon termination of her remarriage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 8857. A bill to establish a national policy with respect to commercial fisheries; to establish the Office of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Commercial Fisheries, and define his functions, powers, and responsibilities; to strengthen the commercial fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 8858. A bill to appropriate funds for construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of Old St. Louis, Mo., as authorized by the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 8859. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8860. A bill to amend section 3A of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the standard contained in paragraph (5) thereof governing salaries used in computation of annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 8861. A bill to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., to the Secretary of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 8862. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a new method for determining monthly compensation in the computation of annuities thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 8863. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 8864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an exclusion from gross income in the case of damages recovered under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17 of each year General Von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. J. Res. 493. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the official founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 494. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the official founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. J. Res. 495. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the right of the States to manage their own internal affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to aid in a program of flood control and hurricane protection; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Adjutant General's Department of the State of Ohio, relative to transmitting a copy of the interstate civil defense and mutual aid compact between the States of New York and Ohio, etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 8865. A bill for the relief of Florentina Laurente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8866. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 8867. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mr. F. M. Bryson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 8868. A bill for the relief of Richardson Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 8869. A bill for the relief of Elisabetta Melon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8870. A bill for the relief of Charles Ang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 8871. A bill for the relief of Anna Marie Deutch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8872. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Gardner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 8873. A bill for the relief of Maria Gonzalez-Tovar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

460. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 17 residents of Plymouth, Iowa, favoring passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

461. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Ernie W. Marshall, and other citizens, of Springfield, Mo., urging having the Townsend plan as defined in H. R. 4471 adopted as an amendment to the Social Security Act, in place of the present program of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Neuberger at the Madison Avenue Baptist Church, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 25, 1956, it was my privilege to address a dinner of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church in New York City under the auspices of one of the most outstanding religious leaders ever to serve in my State.

This man is Dr. Ralph B. Walker, formerly of the White Temple, of Portland, Oregon. I knew Dr. Walker and his charming wife when they were in our own State. Dr. Walker has combined humanitarian and progressive views with deep spiritual feeling and an ability to exalt his listeners. Portland's loss is New York's gain.

On the occasion of addressing Dr. Walker's congregation in the city of New York I also had the privilege of meeting many former residents of Oregon, such as Mr. and Mrs. Owen A. MacGill, formerly of McMinnville; Mr. and Mrs. Ronald S. Callvert, formerly of Portland; Mrs. Lurline Green, a registered nurse, formerly of Portland; and Mr. S. D. Buell, likewise formerly of Portland. These people all told me what a distinction it was to have a pastor like Ralph Walker in the greatest city of our land.

I had the pleasure of discussing my desire to have more young people enter public life, in which connection I explained the $500 scholarship which I have presented to Linfield College to encourage idealistic students with an ambition to work in government. This scholarship is the result of a $500 award which I received from the Democratic clubs of Long Island in 1955 as "Democrat of the Year." I had the honor of formally presenting it to Linfield College in October, through Linfield's out-